

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XLIII No. 4 APRIL 1958

READJUSTMENTS IN FRENCH CATECHETICS

CLOSE on forty years ago, efforts began in France to find remedies for the ineffective religious instruction of children. Later it was realized how little was the actual amount of religious instruction being given. To those eighty per cent of Catholic children who had no other school but the "laicized" State school, one catechism lesson a week was given in the parish by untrained catechists, and that only during the three years which served as a preparation for the "Communion Solennelle". This situation was overshadowed by the problem of the *école libre* as the chief pastoral concern of the hierarchy, but in recent years, thanks to the revived interest in parish catechism method and to the perspicacity and insistence of Canon Colomb, it has taken rank (besides Catholic Action) as one of the three major concerns of the Church in France.

SEARCH FOR A NEW APPROACH

Improvements in the teaching of religion were first directed, in the 'twenties and 'thirties, towards the catechism text itself and towards methods and techniques. Catechisms varied from one diocese to another, and were on the old style of "summaries of theological summaries". The first national catechism of 1937 marked little progress; an improved edition appeared in 1947, and this is to undergo still further modification. Early reformers in method aimed at providing the untrained catechist with worked-out lessons and aids of many kinds, but some, to avoid the danger of spoon-feeding, strove rather to develop the adaptability of the catechist. In this latter type of work Mme Fargues, who at eighty-five still teaches and writes and attends lectures at the Institut Supérieur Catéchétique, was a pioneer, and she has done much to bring home to priests engaged in parish catechizing the need of taking note of child psychology.

She and others experimented in adapting activity methods to religious instruction, and, after the war, with individualized activity methods. After the catechist's explanation of the topic of the week, a period of revision and assimilation for each child is provided, usually in the form of answers to carefully prepared written questions. This is becoming a general feature in parish catechism classes where the revival in method has been introduced. It is idealistic, implying a trained catechist for each group of six to eight children in order to be able to give them individual attention, and it requires considerable preparation for each lesson; it seems therefore workable only if there is one lesson a week, or for purposes of experiment. And apart from the fact that pedagogical considerations are not the highest criterion of religious training, not all catechists are of the calibre of Mme Fargues. Hence the bishops' statement of last September¹ contained remarks on the need for discrimination in the use of activities and visual aids. This is not a condemnation of modern techniques, nor is it concerned with a return to traditional ones. Techniques as such are not in question—but whether the use of a method makes of them respects the transcendent character of revelation and the response of which a baptized child is capable. The statement moreover is more concerned with other errors of adaptation.

The liturgical, biblical and theological revival which has made such strides in France since the war made many catechists realize more vividly than hitherto the true nature of revelation: that besides being a body of objective truths, it is a living message which carries with it the demand for total faith and its implementation in daily life. The presentation of the truths of faith to the intellect only, and of the obligations of the Christian life unrelated to dogma and the sacraments seemed to them to flow from an imperfect understanding of the mystery of our salvation. Should not catechism teaching remain close to Scripture seen as the history of God's dealings with men, and lead to the Liturgy, whereby the mystery of God's love is actualized and communicated?

As the character of revelation was seen more clearly, those who pondered over the problem of adapting their teaching to

¹ For full translation of this, see *The Tablet*, 28 Sept. 1957, p. 268.

the capacity of children saw a difficulty. To teach everything to a given age-group would mean that much of what was said would not convey its message to the children. They concluded that it should be held over until the child was ready to assimilate it. This principle ceased to be valid when the Christian character of revelation was lost sight of for any given age-group. Some catechists, taking their line from God's gradual revelation of Himself in the Old Testament, retarded the presentation of Christ in order to get the children to enter first only into the religious experience of the saints of the Old Testament, forgetting that the children before them had the superior grace of Christian baptism. Others, because our Lord only gradually during His public life revealed who He really was, concluded that He should be first presented as a Man of God, and that the realization of His divinity should be brought gradually home to the children through greater familiarity with the Gospel. Again, to enforce the idea of *personal* sinfulness and the need of a Saviour on that account, the teaching of the doctrine of original sin was retarded. These and similar omissions and errors of method, i.e. of subjecting the presentation or not of this or that fundamental aspect of Christian revelation to what were considered pedagogical necessities, have been pointed out in the bishops' statement already referred to.

Canon Colomb was one of the most active thinkers in adapting to the field of catechetics the findings of the liturgical, biblical and theological revival. He studied the psychology of children according to the different age-groups in order to provide for them a graded religious teaching ("Catéchisme progressif"), and he took from Mme Fargues and others the techniques which best serve the new approach, while warning inexperienced catechists about their limitations and misuse. He published the results of his research in books meant to guide the catechist. They contained perhaps too advanced matter for the untrained. Certain statements in them, moreover, have had to be modified at the request of the Holy Office, and the French hierarchy, in order to remove misapprehensions, has asked that the expression "catéchisme progressif" be dropped. A noteworthy comment on these directives is contained in an "ad clerum" of the Bishop of Tournai, Belgium, dated 30 September:

In what concerns Canon Colomb [it says] it should be clearly noted: (a) that the French hierarchy does not repudiate the *principle* of progressive steps in religious instruction . . .; it simply asks that, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, the term "catéchisme progressif" be avoided; for some, in the belief that they were interpreting rightly Canon Colomb's ideas, have taken for granted that his text-books graded their subject-matter in exactly the same way as for profane subjects; this is a wholly mistaken view that is far from the author's mind. (b) If he has to add to his text-books in some places in accordance with the directives of the statement, his views on the aim and method of religious instruction are identical with those expressed therein by the Bishops' Committee. In the numerous works in which he sets forth his ideas on the subject, many passages can be picked out in which he warns his readers about the dangers which may arise from certain aspects of catechetical method if they are misunderstood or wrongly applied: for instance, "progressivity"; the religious value of "activities"; the balance that must be maintained between the biblical, the liturgical and the doctrinal; the didactic character that must mark their teaching, and the condemning of "celebrations" ["paraliturgies" for children] were they to replace the Sunday Mass.

Mlle Derkenne, by her early efforts in her own parish, and by her honesty of purpose and undoubted talents, has become another well-known figure in the French catechetical movement. Through her close association with Canon Colomb and other leading catechists, and by her constant experimentation at the Institut Supérieur Catéchétique, she was able to integrate into her method and syllabuses for the different age-groups all the currents of research going on today in France. Her particular gift was to work out as a syllabus the presentation of the Christian mystery linked up with its liturgical celebration throughout the year. In her efforts to find a truly nourishing presentation of the content of revelation under a new aspect each year she had some remarkable intuitions, without always having the balanced view that would win the approval of the more theologically trained. Last year she presented the results of her endeavours in the entirely re-written Volume I of the series *Vie et Joie au Catéchisme*. This book also has had to have certain modifications at the request of the Holy Office.

CONTROL AND ORGANIZATION BY THE HIERARCHY

If leading figures in their efforts to discover a more effective way of presenting revealed truth to children sometimes unwittingly failed to respect its transcendent character, this was all the more likely to be the case for the rank and file of their followers. It was because the transposition of profane teaching methods to the field of religious instruction was not without its dangers that the hierarchy began to co-ordinate and direct the many individual efforts. Already in 1942, at the instance of Canon Colomb, it had approved the appointment in each diocese of an Organizer of religious instruction given outside school. (There already existed the diocesan Organizer for the *écoles libres*.) Little, however, was effectively done at the time. But in 1948 the National Committee for Religious Instruction was set up; it now counts fourteen members and has as Chairman Archbishop de Provençères of Aix, with Canon Colomb as Secretary. It studies and advises on diocesan organization. Its day-to-day work is carried on by the Centre National Catéchistique, of which Canon Colomb is still the head. In 1951 a Bishops' Committee consisting of five members was set up; Archbishop de Provençères is chairman here also.

Over the last seven or eight years plans have been drawn up to provide training at five different levels. Details of training at the two lowest levels, that is, for the Assistant Catechist's and the Catechist's Diploma, have been worked out only in the last two years. The National Catechist's Diploma comes next: it is awarded after a year's training and qualifies the professional parish catechist or the school teacher for the teaching of religion. Canon Colomb began the first centre for such training several years ago, and there are only two further ones at present, one in Paris and one in Lille. Beyond this Diploma there is the Religious Teaching Degree (*Licence d'Enseignement Religieux*) which is given after a two years' course, including teaching practice, at the Catholic Universities (*Instituts Catholiques*) of Paris, Lyon and Lille. This training at university level was the conception of Cardinal Suhard, and he also envisaged as crowning the movement a chair of catechetics at the Catholic Institute

in Paris. But in fact a whole Faculty was created there in 1950: L'Institut Supérieur Catéchétique. Its purpose is to promote research with a view to establishing the principles to be observed in transmitting the object of revelation so as to nourish the life of faith, and to train those who in dioceses, novitiates, scholasticates, etc., will be responsible for training others. Fr Coudreau, a Sulpician, was appointed Principal in 1950 and held the post till last August. He succeeded in bringing together a remarkable body of lecturers, including such well-known personalities as Fr Daniélou, S.J., Fr Gelineau, S.J., Fr Roguet, O.P., Canon Boulard. . . . In so far as his other duties allowed, Canon Colomb also lectured over the past two years on religious teaching method. Fr Coudreau, however, gave the main course in this subject and also supervised the practical teaching. In the case of children between the ages of seven to twelve, he virtually left this side of the work in the hands of Mlle Derkenne.

It will take some years before the benefit of all this organization can be assessed. A few dioceses have worked out schemes of parish religious instruction running parallel with the whole of the child's stay in the State school, but many have little actually in operation other than for children of the nine to twelve age-group, i.e. who are preparing for the *Communione Solennelle*. There is still less provided for the training of catechists. The time-lag, in view of the difficulties to be overcome, is bound to be considerable. And on the other hand, enthusiasts, whether of the methods of the "*école nouvelle*" or of the "kerygmatic" presentation of doctrine have been in danger of overstepping the limits of valid religious teaching method and, indirectly, of orthodoxy. This latter imputation has *not* been made (as will be seen below) against the leading figures who have been removed from office.

SOME LACK OF BALANCE IN THE SPIRIT OF THE MOVEMENT—AND AN UNSYMPATHETIC OPPOSITION

Some of those who felt that catechism method has been too concerned with mere learning and not enough with a life of self-committal to Christ, unfortunately made the mistake of

neglecting precise dogmatic instruction. The French are outstanding in their participation in and contribution to the liturgical, biblical and theological revival in the Church today, and they are led by ideas more than we are. This is not without the danger that what rightly figures prominently in the field of research is granted over-much place in catechetical instruction. In a country where many in the Church are capable of sustained intellectual effort and razor-edge keenness of enquiry, it is perhaps almost inevitable that many catechists should be impressed by the new trends without having a balanced grounding in the whole of the Church's teaching. Some, theologically trained according to the new spirit, have indeed recaptured for their teaching some wonderful aspects of the mystery of Christ, in particular the Paschal mystery in all its richness. But on the other hand, seeing exaggeration in certain popular expressions of devotion towards the Infant Jesus in the crib, towards the Sacred Heart or our Lady, or in the popular appeal of Lourdes and pilgrimages generally, they can only react by giving even the true attitude in these devotions little or no place. In other words, some aspects of the Church's teaching, because light has been thrown on their vital quality by recent research, are as such intellectually stimulating and deeply satisfying; they have captured the idealism of catechists, some of whom have not been able at the same time to keep a firm hold on the whole of Catholic Tradition. They have gained a more inspiring understanding of the Bible and the Fathers with most admirable results, but have not made a comparable study of the development of dogma. Some other characteristics of the French need to be taken into account. They are less passive than we in the face of authority: they will take more pains, where they consider it justified, to enlighten authority; they will interpret guidance at times in a way disconcertingly free; and the less restrained may considerably overstep the latitude allowed. Furthermore, many a catechist has, with characteristic individuality, generalized from his own success in one small field and published his method, text-books and aids till there has been a riot of them. It is understandable then that some thoughtful Catholics should express their misgivings.

That some should campaign in virtual defiance of the

hierarchy is more difficult to understand. Since the hierarchy had taken the catechetical movement in hand, complaints against certain of its developments should have gone either to the bishop of the diocese or to the National Committee. Instead, in one region of the West of France, the movement and its leading figures were attacked in a review published by a layman. Duplicated sheets were circulated containing anonymous attacks on these persons. The anonymous character of these attacks—proceeding often by insinuation—was severely blamed by Archbishop de Provençères in a statement published in *La Croix* on the 17 August 1956, while at the same time admitting that research for a better psychological adaptation could run into difficulties. The campaign unfortunately continued, and called forth another statement which appeared in *La Croix* on 5 April 1957. A more detailed one had already been issued by Cardinal Liénart on 31 March, and on 12 April Cardinal Gerlier expressly referred to both of them as having his full agreement. (An article on the campaign, entitled "Charité et Vérité", appeared in the Jesuit review *Etudes* in May 1957, and the statements referred to above are reproduced in *Catéchistes*, No. 31, July 1957.)

THE HOLY OFFICE STEPS IN; THE MEANING OF ITS ACTION

This lack of unity and discipline among a number of French Catholics did not prevent the Holy Office, once it had been made aware that certain errors of adaptation were gaining ground, and that they were contained at least by implication in several widely used method books, from taking the necessary steps to safeguard the true character of religious instruction, even though at the time the opponents of the movement took this action as a triumph for themselves. In August 1957 the Holy Office communicated to Archbishop de Provençères its disapproval of certain aspects of the catechetical movement. This communication, meant for the French hierarchy to act upon, was rightly never published. But a leakage of information was seized upon by certain sections of the Press, and the whole

question was made to appear a crisis in the relations of the Holy See with the Church in France. Every episcopal statement since concerning this Press campaign has been a charge of irresponsibility and tendentious reporting. It is what the hierarchy has said and done since August that can be the only basis of a loyal study of the case.

Fr Coudreau, Canon Colomb and Mlle Derkenne were withdrawn from the Institut Supérieur Catéchétique. Text-books written by the last two persons as well as those of Mlle Digneon, head of the F.C.T.P. Movement (Formation Chrétienne des Tout-Petits), were required to have insertions defining the meaning of certain expressions. On 14 September the Bishops' Committee for Religious Instruction issued a statement (published in *La Croix* on 20 September) setting forth the correct principles of religious pedagogy as opposed to those "errors and deficiencies" which had been pointed out by the Holy Office, and at the same time insisting that the catechetical movement on the whole was not only good but must continue its reforms. In correcting the wrong tendencies that had crept in, and in reaffirming the complete aims of the movement, the Bishops' Committee has made one of the most interesting official statements on religious teaching in recent times. It was commented upon point by point in a lengthy article approved by Cardinal Gerlier and published in the *Semaine Religieuse* of Lyons on 11 October (reproduced in *La Croix* on 15 October, and in *Catéchistes*, January 1958), and it is certain that the *Directoire de pastorale catéchétique* called for by the plenary assembly of the hierarchy last April and promised for July 1959, will be a remarkable statement of official guidance.

The campaign that had been set on foot against the catechetical movement, far from abating, was continued with even less restraint because its originators considered that the bishops had not gone far enough. This attitude called forth a clear censure and a disapproval of the author of the review which fed it, and of his methods of attack, by the Bishop of Angers (see *La Croix*, 1 November), and a call upon the faithful of the diocese to withhold their support from him. Already the Bishop of Tournai, in his "ad clerum" referred to, had expressly stated that "no one had been condemned, and no work put on the

Index" by the Holy Office. But the most lucid presentation of the implications of that intervention is the address delivered by His Lordship Bishop Blanchet, Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris, to the students of the Institut Supérieur Catéchétique on 7 October at the beginning of their academic year. The following extract is taken from that address as reproduced in the *Bulletin de l'Amicale des Anciens* of the Institut Supérieur Catéchétique (1957-8, No. 1):

I come now to the decisions taken in Rome. What are they? What is their meaning and scope?

What is involved, and I say it in full agreement, going back only two or three days, with one of the outstanding members of the Holy Office, is in no way a matter of doctrine. None of the lecturers of the Institut Supérieur Catéchétique is suspected of having taught anything in the least erroneous. I shall go so far as to quote the very words of this representative of the Holy Office: "It would be in the highest degree odious to take advantage of these decisions to suspect the teaching of any of the lecturers of the I.S.C. You have the right to say that as coming from me." That was said of the lecturers as a whole and of each one in particular. When we mentioned definite names, nothing was withdrawn from this statement.

What are involved are methods: methods of teaching religion, and not everything in them. . . . There has never been a wholesale condemnation: the censures have been directed against certain limited points of the methods explained in certain books; not all that these books contain has been condemned; the Roman authorities have even declared certain pedagogical counsels excellent.

It is a question only of certain points in these methods, points nevertheless that are important. The reproach has been made in particular that the teaching of certain Catholic truths has been too much retarded, that not enough reliance has been placed on the grace of baptism and that, through over-concern for teaching method, child development has been the sole guide, instead of the arousing and training of the child's faith by the truths of religion. Through fear of being too early one runs the risk of being too late and of starving certain children of certain truths of religion. As a consequence, the Roman authorities have asked that the faulty passages be corrected. . . . Finally, the methods set out in these books must not be confused with the teaching method employed by the I.S.C. in its practice schools.

What have we done to show that there will be a change? We have been asked to change the Principal and those of the staff concerned with method at the I.S.C. No teaching is now being done here by Canon Colomb, Fr Coudreau or Mlle Derkenne. These departures are painful for us. I say it without bitterness, without any spirit of protest, but simply because I know what we owe to these three.

His Lordship then briefly expressed his appreciation and gratitude towards them. "The Institut Supérieur Catéchétique," he said further, "continues at the request of the authorities in Rome and in full agreement with the representatives of the hierarchy of the Church in France. . . . It sets forth again to think out once more its method." And he called for still more serious work in the loyal service of the Church.¹

FOR THE FUTURE: THE SAME VITALITY, CLOSER TO THE CHURCH'S TEACHING MISSION

A few words written on 14 December by Bishop Weber of Strasbourg appeared in the January 1958 number (series 37, fiche No. 313) of the catechetical review *Vérité et Vie*. They stress the confidence always maintained by the Holy See towards the Church in France by quoting from the Holy Father's letter of 9 November to Cardinal Liénart in connexion with the Lourdes centenary year. The Holy Father mentions "the substantial progress realized during the last few decades" in France, and goes on to say:

The strength of Christian institutions—your schools in particular, maintained at such great sacrifice—the great number of initiatives in all fields, the persistent research in sectors all the dearer to the hearts of apostolic men because they are more difficult, the readiness to serve all the great causes of the Church and to respond to appeals such as that which We launched in the Encyclical *Fidei Domum*: all these are signs of a vitality full of

¹ Fr Coudreau has since been given by the hierarchy the mission of undertaking research concerning the now important question in France of the adult catechumenate. Recently with the hierarchy's approval, Bishop Blanchet named him "Honorary Principal" of the Institut Supérieur Catéchétique.

promise, which never ceases to bring Us joy, even when at times We have to impose a check on some of its impulse and curb some of its ardour.

Bishop Weber comments thus on this last phrase:

If it is an invitation to greater prudence and an entire docility to the directives of the Apostolic See, which we promise with sincere heart, it can, in its context, be in no wise assimilated to a repudiation of what has been done in our country, even in catechetical matters. On the contrary: one does not need to "check the impulse and curb the ardour" of those who do nothing, or who do nothing but criticize and raise up difficulties for those whose concern it is to work and to serve.

And he quotes once more the Pope's letter:

Let no one be stopped by the difficulties in the way. Let the Catholics of France, united among themselves by the bonds of charity, and grouped around their pastors, advance with confidence along the already long and glorious road traced out by their forbears and marked by so many saints.

This advance, in things catechetical, is possible now along a truer road because the needed reorientation has been accepted. In the first place by the leading promoters of the movement, even though it has been painful to themselves personally. It has been accepted also by their followers in spite of their first humiliation and frustration because their opponents could say they were justified. It is to their no small credit that they have submitted so well to the guidance contained in the hierarchy's statement. That guidance has been summed up (see the article in the *Semaine Religieuse* of Lyon of 11 October already referred to) under three heads: a special effort of greater fidelity towards the Church; a deeper grasp of revealed truth; and a more balanced religious teaching method. As that article concludes: "The statement of the Bishops' Committee for Religious Instruction gives us the opportunity of coming nearer to that ideal which every catechist, resembling in that respect the promoters of the movement for religious instruction, bears within himself."

BR. ALFRED, F.S.C.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY

(Concluded)

THE Church's dogma of the resurrection includes three points: at the last day men will rise from the dead; this resurrection is universal, and even the unjust will rise; men will receive again their identical bodies. Theological reflexion on the first two points will be largely concerned with the place of the resurrection in the history of salvation. This has already been dealt with; it could receive more attention from theologians. The third point presents a difficult speculative problem, and those with a philosophical bent of mind have a right to have their questions considered.

We shall rise with these selfsame bodies. The strict or numerical identity of the risen body with the body of this life is a truth of faith. There can be no doubt or question about it. The problem is to decide how this identity is realized. What is the basis in reality that secures such an identity? Even in this life, there is a similar problem. The human body remains one and the same despite a continuous flow of change in all its elements. The parts and cells of our bodies are frequently renewed and are in a state of constant change. What maintains the body as the same body? There is an even deeper problem in the identity between a risen body and a body that has disintegrated in corruption.

A first solution, put forward formerly, may be quickly passed over; it doesn't seem to be held nowadays. According to it, there are a number of basic particles essentially belonging to each individual man. They remain intact in him from conception to death, whereas all the rest of the body is subject to change. Only these are required for the identity of the body, and after the death of each man they remain in the universe as his by right. God in His omnipotence will gather them all together at the last day. As to the rest of the matter required, that can be supplied without detriment to the individuality of the body from whatever matter is available. This theory lacks any philosophical or empirical basis.

The second solution has been, and still is, the more common opinion. Indeed many theologians reach for their list of theological censures when anyone departs from it. In this explanation, what the soul receives again is the same quantified matter which it had in this life. It is the popular idea; the soul takes up the same matter it left to corrupt as a corpse in the tomb. To put it more technically: an appeal is made, in order to ensure identity, to a phenomenal and historical continuity between the risen body and the past mortal body. There is no question now of any unchanging basic particles. It is admitted that the entire matter of each body is a state of continuous change. But the risen body will be the same as the body of this life because it will be made out of historically the same quantified matter into which the mortal body disintegrated.

Easy to imagine, this theory is philosophically more complicated than at first sight appears. Suppose one rejects any atomist theory—that is, the idea that matter consists of permanent incorruptible particles that remain the same under the processes of change: in what sense then can one speak of the reconstruction of a body from the same matter? If material things are constituted of prime matter, which is pure potency, and form, and if a substantial change causes a new form to arise, in what sense can the same identical matter ever be retrieved, once such a change has taken place? Unless there is a permanence of elements at least on the phenomenal level, the same matter can only be retrieved, after substantial change, in this limited sense: the new things generated by the corruption give back a part of their substance proportionate to the quantity they drew from the corrupted thing. The point may be illustrated in this way. Throw a drop of water in a lake and suppose it loses completely its individuality in the lake, that same drop cannot be recovered. All that is possible is to take out of the lake a drop equal in quantity to the one put in. Reject all atomism, and that is what happens in substantial change. A new form takes over, and the identity of the previous thing is entirely lost. If some form of atomist theory is admitted—at the very minimum, a permanence at the level of empirical characteristics—then the divine power can gather together the same atoms or particles which made up the body in this life. The

holders of this opinion do not demand that all the matter which enters into the constitution of the body in this life should be revived at the resurrection. In view of the fact that the matter of our bodies is constantly renewed, any such demand would give us at the last day rather more than we could cope with. Enough matter is taken up in the resurrection to constitute a satisfactory body. Preference is usually given to the matter finally left aside at death; according to many authors, this alone is concerned in the resurrection. It is also added that it is sufficient for identity if part of the risen body consists of matter informed during this life. There would otherwise be no answer to the difficulty about the risen bodies of those born prematurely or to the more unreal difficulty of those nourished exclusively in this life on human flesh.

Is this solution satisfactory? Tradition puts it in a very strong position, but it reveals troubling weaknesses when examined speculatively. If what ensures the identity between the risen body and the mortal body is the historical and empirical continuity between the matter in both, then where that continuity is partial, the identity can only be partial. There will not then, for example, be a strict identity but only a partial identity between the risen body and mortal body of a deformed infant that died at birth. Surely identity must be secured at a deeper level. Further, even if the historical continuity is fully verified, it would not ensure the strict numerical identity of the risen body and the mortal body. It can be convincingly argued that the reconstituted body would inevitably be a numerically different body. Suppose a statue made of bronze is melted down and then re-cast from the same bronze. It would not be the same statue, but a new and similar one. The resurrection in strict identity of animals was considered an impossibility by St Thomas, because no numerical identity of form could be obtained. The point is this. Matter marked out by quantity is the principle of individuation, but this designation of a part of matter must include the relationship to place and time and also the relation of the piece to the other individuals with which it is connected. There cannot be a strict identity between material things that arise at different times, in different places, and from different antecedent things. Let us suppose that all the

original elements of a body have been gathered together by a miracle. Even if there is a permanence of all and each of the atoms and these are arranged in exactly the same way, the body produced is still a body made at another time, by another cause, from different antecedents, and consequently not the same identical body. It is indeed similar to the former body, but it is not numerically the same body. Unless that is, one can point to some higher principle securing identity.

What does the third solution offer? This puts the reason for the strict identity of the risen body with our present body solely in the identity of the spiritual soul. This remains uninterruptedly in being, and is as form that which gives to the body its being and its unity. If one holds the Thomist doctrine that there is only one form in man, the problem we are struggling with ceases. Man is made up of prime matter and a unique form, the spiritual soul. The soul is the one determining principle that constitutes man in his entire being. It determines him, not merely as man, but also as animal, as living being, as body, as substance, even as being. The soul is the source of every perfection and determination in man. The real distinction in man is not between body and soul, but between soul and prime matter. Philosophically then for the Thomist, nothing else is required for the identity of the body than the identity of the soul or form. The soul immediately informs prime matter; as soon then as the soul takes over and informs a certain quantity of matter, this becomes the self-same identical body previously possessed. The unity and identity of a thing comes from the form; where there is numerically the same form, there must be numerically the same thing. From the metaphysical point of view the notorious statement of Durandus was perfectly sound, in which he said that if in the resurrection the soul of Peter was united to the corpse of Paul, and the soul of Paul to the corpse of Peter, the corpse of Paul would at once become the body of Peter, identical with his mortal body, and the corpse of Peter the body of Paul, identical with his mortal body.

An attractive solution. Nevertheless, theologians fight shy of it; it is untraditional, they urge. The principle behind it is found in St Thomas, and he uses it as a partial solution, but it

was Du
Its gre
and he
to view
conside
indicat
keepin
view. I
seems,
difficul
doctrin
particu
is right
resurre
person
nizable
necessa
is but i
metaph
use of
should
in tha
Th
but th
(I ma
differ
tion a
us tha
was n
Lazar

¹ See
carefull
cere; se
videtur
ita conc
haec se
dictum
sententi
formae

² Th
the res
Positiva
Vol

was Durandus who first put it forward as a complete solution. Its great exponent in modern times has been Cardinal Billot, and he has had a few followers, but most theologians continue to view it askance. The very fact that it solves the difficulty is considered an argument against it, since this is taken as an indication that its understanding of the resurrection is not in keeping with tradition.¹ Here, however, I am of the minority view. Frankly, if one holds Thomistic philosophy, there can, it seems, be no other basic explanation. Moreover, it would be difficult, I think, to establish that tradition taught as revealed doctrine, not only the strict identity of the body, but also a particular explanation of this. At the same time, Fr de Broglie² is right to insist on adding a qualification to this solution. In the resurrection of the body, the soul will in fact take up again the person's own remains, when these still exist in some recognizable way at the end of the world. This is not metaphysically necessary, nor will such a re-assumption be always possible. It is but incidental to a true resurrection. But God is not moved by metaphysical considerations alone, and there is a fitness in the use of the personal remains, when these are still extant, which should lead us to assert with tradition that God will in fact act in that way.

The resurrection is the restoration to us of our same bodies, but these will be received in a new state; they will be glorified. (I may leave aside here the resurrection of the damned; this is different in its significance.) It is wrong to think of the resurrection after the manner of the raising of Lazarus. A sign teaching us that Christ came as the Resurrection and Life, this miracle was none the less in a different order to our resurrection. Lazarus came back to this earthly existence and remained sub-

¹ See, for example, this passage of Fr Lennerz, who usually weights his words carefully: "Praeterea concedendum est, difficultates in hac explicatione evanescere; sed hoc ipsum magnum est praeiudicium contra hanc sententiam; nam inde videtur apparere, resurrectionem et identitatem corporis in hac sententia non iam ita concipi, ut Patres et theologi communiter concipiunt. Hinc quoque est, quod haec sententia ad testimonium Patrum provocare non possit. Immo Patres, ut dictum est, alio modo identitatem corporis intellexerunt. Theologi, postquam haec sententia proposita est, quasi omnes erant contrarii, ii quoque, qui unicitatem formae admittunt" (*De Novissimis*, p. 181).

² Throughout this part of the paper I am greatly indebted to the treatment of the resurrection in Fr de Broglie's *De Fine Ultimo Humanae Vitae: Pars Prior, Positiva*, Paris, 1948. It is the finest available.

ject to corruption and death; we pass into a new order of existence. The resurrection is the reintegration of ourselves as men; nothing is lost of our identity and nature. Yet as men, body and soul, we are transformed. Our being passes into a new and higher existence, a share in the divine life. In other words, there takes place the full deployment in our being of the life of grace, and this involves a transmutation or sublimation of our bodies and our bodily life.

What does that mean? Revelation gives us very little information about the glorified body. In Paul's great chapter on the resurrection, the fifteenth in I Corinthians, he calls the risen body a spiritual body: "It is sown a physical (*psychikon*) body, it is raised a spiritual (*pneumatikon*) body" (v. 44). The Pauline term must be properly understood. This becoming spiritual is in no way opposed to the idea of a truly corporal resurrection. It means that the risen body is transformed by, is penetrated with, the Spirit. For us, spiritual means immaterial, but that is not what Paul has in mind. For him, Spirit is the divine power, light and holiness. The stress is on what we nowadays call the supernatural. His teaching is that the risen bodies are brought within the divine sphere and share the divine qualities of power, glory, splendour and holiness.¹ "What is sown," he writes, "is perishable, what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body" (vv. 42-4). And then a few verses later: "Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven" (v. 49).

This last text reminds us that in the resurrection of Christ we have the exemplar and cause of our own. It must be stressed again and again that the resurrection of Christ is not simply a miracle proving His claims. It is a turning-point in world history; it is the beginning of a new existence for Christ, and the risen Christ is the image and the type, the first-fruits of a new world; in Him was inaugurated a new state of creation. Our resurrection bodies will be similar to the glorified body of Christ; for by our resurrection we share fully in the risen life of Christ.

¹ Cf. L. Cerfaux, *Le Christ dans la théologie de Saint Paul*, Paris, 1951, p. 64, n. 3.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY 211

What was the risen body of Christ like? Well, it was clearly a body in the sense of a tangible and extended reality. Further, it still possessed the characteristically human shape and form. Attempts to over-spiritualize the risen body, to volatilize away its materiality, always come up against the experience of the Apostles that the risen Christ had a true human body. However mysterious and far-reaching the transmutation of our bodies in the resurrection, the Christian tradition affirms quite clearly that they retain a true corporeity in human shape and structure.

The Fathers and theologians go on to speak of the integrity and natural perfection enjoyed by our risen bodies. The principle is unassailable; patently, a risen body cannot be mutilated or incomplete. At the same time, the attempts of curiosity to apply the principle in detail should be restrained. The common teaching tells us that difference of sex is preserved, though a number of the Fathers would not have agreed. Beyond that, the further inferences concerning a so-called perfect age and stature are valueless.

Our bodies then, profoundly changed, will remain truly bodies, perfected in their corporal reality. Yet the risen body of Christ, although in some way present to the apostles in space and time and inserted into the texture of our world, was of a different order of existence and no longer bound down by the laws of this universe. The appearances of Christ to His apostles were not the same as mystical visions; they were encounters with the objective reality of Christ's body. But if for the apostles they were perceptions, the narratives show that they were perceptions of a unique kind. So far this has not provoked much reflexion on the part of theologians. The valuable pages on this subject by M. Guitton¹ may stimulate some further efforts. The accounts give the impression of an irruption into this world of something from a different order, and the perception of the risen Christ seems to have been a privilege that required in the recipient an openness to the higher order thus manifested. M. Guitton goes so far as to say: "But it would seem to me that if Tiberias or Tacitus, if Philo or Pilate or Josephus had happened to be present in that room where Jesus appeared, none

¹ *The Problem of Jesus*, London, 1955, pp. 169-217.

of these would have seen anything at all" (p. 214). Christ gave to His apostles and disciples these experiences of His risen body as signs that led them to their act of faith in His resurrection; objective perceptions indeed, but of a unique presence, to which they bore true but unusual testimony.

The body of Christ belonged to another order, and was free from the limitations imposed on us in this spatio-temporal existence. A similar existence will be given to our risen bodies. Can we feel our way any further in describing the characteristics of this mode of being? "All this," writes M. Guittou, "reminds me that I am not quite sure what a body is" (p. 138). He then shakes our complacency by asking: "Are the ideas of space and time, of volume and mass and life, necessarily associated with the idea of body? They certainly are, if the body is only matter. But if matter is assumable by spirit, which we see it is even in our present existence, does it depend fundamentally on space-time and biology? Can we not conceive the possibility of the body's being no longer subject to space, no longer submitting to it, or treating the physical world as an instrument?" (pp. 139-40). That seems to me personally to over-spiritualize the risen body and to be philosophically somewhat dubious. Admittedly, there is less confidence nowadays in what is held about the constitution of the material universe. That perhaps should make us at least more cautious in dogmatizing about conditions in the renewed universe of the future.

The more traditional approach to the conditions of our risen existence is to distinguish four endowments given to resurrected bodies: impassibility, splendour, agility, and subtlety. This enumeration has been a commonplace in theology since the thirteenth century. Though not in a universally consistent way, it is often connected with the text of St Paul already quoted (I Cor. xv, 42-4). It is a mistake, however, to ascribe to Paul this Scholastic analysis.

Splendour and agility need little comment. Splendour means that the glorified bodies will offer unblemished beauty to the sight. Most are led by the transfiguration to affirm further that our bodies will possess a supernatural radiance, the bodily brightness of our spiritual glory. Agility is an aspect of our freedom from the material limitations of this present existence;

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY 213

it has been affirmed since the fourth century. It indicates the ease with which we will be able to move from place to place. Authors disagree about the mechanics of it. St Thomas, and most with him, think that the body will be transferred by an act of will, but in a way that will still involve movement through the intervening space and some lapse of time. Suarez hoped to dispense with both those requirements.

Subtlety bears several different meanings. For some, it is the ability to pass through other bodies. Strange how the one endowment everyone seems to associate with the risen body is quite uncertain! Christ passed through the closed doors of the upper room, but was that due to the habitual condition of his glorified body or to a particular miracle of divine power, as many of the Fathers thought? At any rate, such an endowment of co-existing locally with other bodies cannot be affirmed with certainty and would render the conditions of existence very complicated in the renewed but still material universe.

Subtlety has another meaning for St Thomas. It indicates the basic gift of the glorified body which makes perfect its union with the spiritual soul. There is achieved an integration of man's nature, and the material side of it is put into perfect harmony and rhythm with the spiritual. The glorification of the body excludes the imperfections which flow from its materiality. These encumber the spirit in its natural union with the body. In the resurrection, matter is made perfectly subordinate to spirit; it becomes malleable in its association with the spiritual soul. If it is the meaning and purpose of the body to be the expression of the soul, and its medium in activity and communication, then the earthly body is but an imperfect body, and the body in the full sense will be the risen body. The human body is formed by spirit; subtlety will allow the spirit and its divine life full sway in its perfecting of matter, so that this may become an apt co-principle in its life.

It is necessary to distinguish several elements in the gift of impassibility. The first is immunity from all bodily evil. Clearly affirmed in Scripture, this is also something bound up with the meaning of redemption. Suffering and death came into this world by sin, and Christ came to deliver us from these evils as well as from sin. Tradition, both patristic and Scholastic, then

goes on to affirm a second element in impassibility. There will be no need to guard the risen body against corruption by taking any measures to keep it in being. Its incorruptibility will be an impossibility of corruption, and not a mere external preservation through God's Providence. This intrinsic incorruptibility will free us in our risen life from all concern with the necessities of our present material existence, such as food, drink, and sleep. These will cease to be essential requirements for our bodily life.

The Scholastics pursue this line of thought even further and introduce a third element into impassibility. They bring the movement of bodily life to a standstill and will not allow any internal change in the risen body, except the qualitative changes involved in sense knowledge. This fits in with the mediaeval conception according to which material things fall into two groups, heavenly and sublunary. Heavenly bodies, such as the stars, are, it was thought, in no way subject to intrinsic change but only to local motion. The risen bodies must share in such a perfection. Besides, all substantial changes in the world are due to the movement of the heavens. This will cease in the renewed universe, and consequently so will the changes, including those of the human body.

This last element in impassibility has been re-examined recently by Fr de Broglie,¹ and he sees in it a very questionable hypothesis. The point has quite a wide bearing. It concerns the restoration of our bodily life after the resurrection and the physiology of the risen body. What is called vegetative life is the fundamental life of a living body. It involves many different operations: those connected with eating and drinking, the activities associated with breathing and the circulation of the blood, and so on. All these manifestations of bodily life can be reduced to two basic forms of activity, namely, assimilation and disassimilation in regard to the various substances proffered to the living organism. Can we suppose that the risen body is utterly deprived of these activities? The Scholastics had no idea of the wonderful complexity and harmony of the life of the body, with the life of all its innumerable cells, such as this has been revealed to us by modern science. Now that the intricately

¹ Op. cit., pp. 282-94.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY 215

woven pattern of incessant change in the human body has been displayed to us, is it possible to conceive any longer a living human body of marble-like immobility? The existence, too, of a sense-life is jeopardized by such a conception, since the two levels of life seem inseparably connected. The problem then faces us: can we reject the Scholastic conception of impassibility and maintain that a vegetative life continues in the risen body.

From the theological point of view, the problem is tied up with the discussions about the eating and drinking by the risen Christ. The Scriptures tell us that after His resurrection Christ ate and drank with His apostles. Was this a real eating and drinking? Many, like St Thomas, think that no vital assimilation of the food and drink was involved; it was not then in the full sense an eating and drinking. Others maintain that there was an exceptional and miraculous assimilation. St Augustine, however, understood it as a real eating with assimilation, and he attributed to all the risen a true and habitual power of eating and drinking. An examination of the patristic tradition leads Fr de Broglie to assert that it is not unanimous over the power of eating and drinking in the blessed, and its authority obliges us only to exclude any need for food and drink. The Scholastic teaching is due to their false physics. He concludes then that one is allowed to hold, and he clearly favours the idea, that there will be a true vegetative life in the risen body, with the various activities of assimilation and disassimilation. To put in another way, there will be eating and drinking and all that organic life we now see to be the basic life of a living body. At the same time, there will be no need for food and drink, because the blessed will be able to suspend at will the common laws of human life and live above them when they so desire. And if any one objects that the risen body will be corruptible, if there is to be a continual change and circulation of matter within it, he answers that the incorruptibility belongs to it as a body, and not to its individual cells and elements.

In the remarks of M. Guitton previously quoted and in this opinion of Fr de Broglie, we see two different trends in recent thinking about the resurrection. M. Guitton so stresses the transformation of the body that one fears for the truly bodily

character of the resurrection. On the other hand, Fr de Broglie so stresses the possession of a true body with its life that he aggravates disturbingly the difficulty that many thinkers find with the resurrection: how to conceive as everlasting a thing and a life that seem essentially transitory. His ideas are very attractive, until one remembers that such a life has to be conceived as eternal. Was it perhaps more than false physics that made the Scholastics give to the risen body and the renewed material universe something of the immutability characteristic of a spirit in possession of its last end?

Our gropings before such problems should not make us forget the importance of the resurrection of the body in Christian teaching. What matters is not the speculative analysis of the resurrection but our faith in it. Our belief in it is in fact our belief that man in all that he is has been saved. It is our belief that salvation comes to us from the risen Christ. It is our belief in the cosmic extent of God's saving plan. The risen body is our solidarity with the recreated universe in Christ Jesus.

CHARLES DAVIS

PRACTICES OF DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART

BEFORE the recent publication of *Haurietis Aquas* new explanations of the devotion to the Sacred Heart were being put forward by theologians, the tendency being—in some cases—to emphasize less and less the role of the physical heart. Some, indeed, went so far as to suggest that the cult of the physical heart was in no way essential to the official devotion. This matter has now been decided by the Holy Father's authoritative teaching. "From . . . the teaching of the Encyclical on the object of the devotion we may conclude that the cult of the physical heart of Jesus is essential," writes Fr Francis Courtney, S.J., in a recent article on the Encyclical published

in T
the h
symb
infus

"
invis
is kn
is lik
symb
(a co
fathe
much
whos
it he
the h
us. T
passa

I
o
F
I
phys
His
wou
tisin
1
This
2
3
effect
4
there
of the
role i
p. 34
repre

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART 217

in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*.¹ The Encyclical further explains that the heart of our Saviour is to be venerated as a "natural symbol" of His threefold love, namely, His divine love, His infused love and His sensitive love.

THE NATURAL SYMBOL OF LOVE

"A symbol in general is a visible sign which signifies some invisible or spiritual reality distinct from itself."² Since a sign is known before one knows the object which it signifies, a symbol is likewise perceived (at least, logically) *prior*³ to the object symbolized—as, for instance, when the sight of a national flag (a conventional symbol) gives rise to the thought of a distant fatherland. In the case of a natural symbol the relationship is much closer and more intimate—as, for example, when a man, whose attention is focused on his wife's face, sees *in it and through it* her love for him. Likewise, when our attention is focused on the heart of Christ we see *in it and through it*. His ardent love for us. This practice of the devotion is summed up in the following passage from the Encyclical:

When we worship the most Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ, in It and through It we are worshipping both the uncreated love of the Word of God, and at the same time His human love and His other emotions and virtues.⁴

In these words the Holy Father clearly teaches how the physical heart of Christ is to be worshipped as the symbol of His love. This is therefore one practice of the devotion, and it would seem to be the main one. But, is it the *only* way of practising the official devotion? A number of post-encyclical writers

¹ "Devotion to the Sacred Heart", *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1947, XLII, p. 341. This article evaluates fairly the views of Frs K. Rahner, J. Galot and others.

² *Nuntius Apostolicus Orationis*, 1957, p. 227.

³ Hence the "natural symbol" of love is not synonymous with the "natural effect" of love which will be described later.

⁴ *A.A.S.*, xlviii (1956), p. 336. *C.T.S.*, trans., n. 43. The *real* heart of flesh is therefore the symbol of Christ's love. This, however, does not dispense with *images* of the Sacred Heart (pictures, statues, etc.) which play an important pastoral role in stimulating the faithful to practise the devotion. *Haurietis Aquas* (*A.A.S.*, p. 342 s) reminds us that honour shown to images passes to the reality which they represent. Our Saviour commended this practice to Margaret Mary (9th promise).

have already answered in the affirmative.¹ However (*salvo meliore iudicio*) another view, which appears to be consistent with the text of the Encyclical, is here tentatively suggested for discussion. The reasons for proposing this interpretation are as follows.

POPULAR DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART

There are many Catholics who are sincerely desirous of obeying the Holy Father's wish that they should make the official devotion to the Sacred Heart the centre of their whole religion. But, although they readily *adore* the heart of Christ as a symbol of His love, yet when *praying* to the Sacred Heart (which they constantly do) they seem to find difficulty in keeping their attention on the heart of flesh; since they naturally tend to pray to the Person of Christ rather than to His heart which *of itself* cannot hear them.

Consequently, the words "Sacred Heart" tend to mean the Person of Christ rather than His heart of flesh. Hence it is customary to speak of a statue of "the Sacred Heart", that is, of *the whole Christ* manifesting His love by showing His heart. This manner of speech seems to be very widespread. For instance, writing from Spain, Fr J. Solano, S.J., declares:

The use of speech is changeable, and so it can happen that the name, "Heart of Jesus", may designate directly the Person of Christ showing His Heart. . . . This manner of concept and speech is increasing in common use, so that Heart of Jesus is gradually acquiring a directly personal meaning, but in such a way that the Person of Christ is envisaged with respect to His interior life and especially His love which has been so much despised. In like manner the term, "Immaculate Conception", originally designated a special attribute of the Blessed Virgin, but little by little it has come to mean the person of Mary adorned with this attribute.²

¹ E.g. M. J. Donnelly, "Haurietis Aquas and Devotion to the Sacred Heart", *Theological Studies*, 18 (1957), pp. 17-40. *Nuntius Apostolatus Orationis*, 1957, pp. 225-9. Francis Courtney, loc. cit.

² J. Solano, *Sacrae theologiae summa*, 3, n. 545.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART 219

Fr J. Bainvel, S.J., has reported a similar state of affairs in France:

In everyday language the word "heart", by a figure of speech which grammarians call synecdoche, is often used to designate a person. . . . When we say "What a great heart!", it is to the person we are directly alluding, not to his heart. This is done quite naturally in the devotion to the Sacred Heart. Margaret Mary says "Sacred Heart" just as she would say "Jesus". In the two cases it is the Person she has directly in view. It has now become the general custom to designate Jesus by the name of the Sacred Heart. . . . This transference of the Heart to the Person . . . affords the devotion greater freedom and a wider sphere of action.¹

The same holds true of the southern hemisphere. The present writer some years ago discussed this question with a former editor of *The Australian Messenger of the Sacred Heart*—Fr Eustace Boylan, S.J., of happy memory—who during his long term of office had received thousands of letters from devotees of the Sacred Heart. He was asked: "Which do the faithful usually mean by the words 'Sacred Heart'—the heart or the Person?" Without hesitation he replied: "The Person. . . . Some even speak of the heart of the Sacred Heart."

This widespread interpretation of the devotion is nowhere corrected in *Haurietis Aquas*. It is true that the Encyclical strongly emphasizes the practice of devotion to the physical heart of Christ as the symbol of His love, but it does not thereby exclude the popular practice of the devotion. On the contrary it appears to leave room for the latter within the ambit of the official devotion, as will now be explained.

THE NATURAL EFFECT OF LOVE

The first half of the Encyclical expounds the Biblical basis of the devotion. In the Old Testament the divine love is clearly revealed, in the New Testament both the divine and human

¹ J. Bainvel, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 3, 284.

loves of our Redeemer. Since Christ was true Man (as well as true God) both these loves reacted on His human heart, since (as the Pope explains) "the Heart of our Redeemer is a living heart, endowed no less than ours with the power of feeling, of beating with the many emotions of His soul and pulsating with the burning love of His twofold will".¹

His Holiness then describes a number of occasions during our Lord's life on earth when His heart was profoundly moved:

The Heart of Jesus *beat with urgent charity* when from His lips there fell words of ardent love. For example, when He beheld the tired and hungry crowds, He cried out, "I have compassion on the multitude." . . . His Heart also *throbbed with love* for His heavenly Father—as well as with holy indignation—when He saw unholy commerce being carried on in the Temple. . . .²

When Pius XII here proposes for veneration the loving pulsations of the heart of Christ, he describes them as the *natural effect* of Christ's love rather than as its natural symbol. So, veneration of the physical heart of Christ as *profoundly moved* by His love for men is clearly in accordance with devotion to the Sacred Heart as explained in *Haurietis Aquas*. This veneration of the heart of flesh can be done either directly (as just described), or *indirectly*, that is, by venerating our *loving* Saviour; because in the latter case a vivid realization of His love will include (more or less explicitly) the thought of the natural effect of His love on His heart. In the latter practice of the devotion "the loving Person of Christ" is honoured *signate*, His heart of flesh *exercite*. Conversely, in the primary practice of the cult the physical heart (as symbol) is adored *signate*, the Person *exercite*.

The Encyclical provides several other instances of this popularized aspect of the devotion, particularly when His Holiness eloquently describes the sentiments of Christ's heart as He bestowed on us His greatest gifts.³

¹ A.A.S., p. 327. C.T.S., trans., n. 26.

² A.A.S., p. 330. C.T.S., trans., n. 31. Italics mine (likewise in other citations).

³ A.A.S., p. 331 ss. C.T.S., trans., n. 34 ff.

GOSPEL PRACTICE OF THE DEVOTION

The first half of *Haurietis Aquas* is principally concerned with the basis of devotion to the Sacred Heart as revealed in Sacred Scripture, particularly the Gospels. This basis is twofold. Firstly, Christ was true God and true Man, and therefore His love (both human and divine) manifested itself in the movements of His human heart. Secondly, because of the hypostatic union the heart of Christ is worthy of the same adoration as is given to the divine Person.

The second part of the Encyclical deals with the adoration of the heart of Christ as the symbol of His love, and how this practice of the devotion has developed gradually from its Gospel foundation. But before treating this latter aspect of the devotion in the light of Catholic tradition, the Pope "by way of summary" (*ad summam*) describes briefly the devotion as already seen "by the light of the Gospel". Since interpretations of this passage may differ, I quote it from the original Latin version:

Putamus autem animadversiones has Nostras, quae *Evangelii luce* collustrantur, in comperto posuisse hunc cultum *nihil aliud, ad summam* quod pertinet, *esse nisi Incarnati Verbi divini humanique amoris cultum*, atque etiam nisi illius amoris cultum, quo caelestis quoque Pater et Spiritus Sanctus peccatores homines prosequuntur.¹

When the Holy Father says that the practice of devotion to the Sacred Heart "in the light of the Gospel" consists in nothing else than "the worship of the divine and human love of the Divine Word Incarnate . . .", we take it that this latter expression is not to be understood in the abstract, i.e. prescinding these loves from the Word Incarnate, but in the concrete, that is, signifying *the whole Christ with special emphasis on His love* (in the manner already described in the practice of "the popular devotion to the Sacred Heart").

It has been suggested that the foregoing text from the Encyclical should be understood in the light of a previous statement

¹ A.A.S., p. 337 s. The divine love for man is common to the three divine Persons, as His Holiness here reminds us.

(which has already been quoted in this article)—“When we adore the Sacred Heart, in It and through It we adore the uncreated and human love of the Divine Word.”¹ This suggestion, however, seems to apply undue force to the wording of the passage under consideration, since the words “*nihil aliud esse*” would appear to rule out other elements in the particular form of the “cult” here summarized. Besides, the Holy Father emphasizes the fact that He is now speaking “in the light of the Gospel”, from which it would seem that the “cult” spoken of is not the cult of the heart as symbol; since elsewhere His Holiness clearly states that “Sacred Scripture nowhere mentions veneration of the physical heart of the Word Incarnate as the *symbol* of His ardent love.” But although the Gospels do not mention (even implicitly) this latter form of the devotion, they do implicitly reveal the *sentiments* of the physical heart, for instance, when they tell us that Christ had “compassion” on the multitude.

Perhaps, at this point, some one might be inclined to ask: “Why not call this form of the devotion simply ‘devotion to our Lord?’” The reason is that the latter title does not necessarily imply the all-important element of our Lord’s love, which is so strongly stressed by the words “Sacred Heart”. A Jansenist could not consistently practise “devotion to the Sacred Heart”, but he could practise “devotion to our Lord” regarding Him as a Judge to be feared. This does not imply that devotion to the Sacred Heart has been mainly of value as an antidote against Jansenism in its heyday. The Encyclical shows that the devotion is also of special importance in these times of widespread hatred of religion.²

THE TRADITIONAL PRACTICE OF THE DEVOTION

After considering the devotion “in the light of the Gospel”, the Holy Father turns to its traditional aspect, that is, the cult of our Saviour’s heart as the symbol (or image) of His love:

It must be admitted that only little by little and gradually has that same Heart been honoured by the homage of a special

¹ A.A.S., p. 336. C.T.S., trans., n. 43.

² A.A.S., p. 348. C.T.S., trans., n. 56.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART 223

devotion, as the mirror of the human and divine love that resides in the Word Incarnate. . . . If we wish to touch on the more important stages in the development of this devotion through the centuries, as regards its outward manifestations, then there immediately occur to our minds the names of certain men and women who have won particular renown in this regard. . . . To cite some examples . . . St Bonaventure, St Albert the Great, St Gertrude, St Catherine of Siena, Blessed Henry Suso, St Peter Canisius and St Francis de Sales. . . . But . . . the principal place is held by St Margaret Mary Alacoque. . . .¹

It is not necessary to dwell further on this practice of the devotion, since it is obviously the main purpose of *Haurietis Aquas* to explain and promote it. But even though the Encyclical sets out to treat *ex professo* of the cult of the Heart of Jesus as the symbol of His love, it nevertheless does so without excluding the popular practice of the devotion, as already explained. Hence the following statement of Fr J. Bainvel would still appear to hold true:

. . . [Church] documents have made one point perfectly clear—devotion to the Sacred Heart is, first and foremost, devotion to the loving *Heart* of Jesus. . . . But there are other passages—often in the same documents—that point to something else as being also the object. Sometimes the reference is to our Lord's sacred Person . . . to *Jesus Himself*, wholly and entirely, designated personally by the name of the Sacred Heart.²

RELATION BETWEEN PRACTICES OF DEVOTION

The relationship between the two foregoing practices of the devotion is explained as follows. The loving pulsation of the heart of Christ is the *natural effect* of His ardent love, and it is precisely because of this that the same loving pulsation is taken as the *natural sign or symbol* of His love. Hence the traditional practice of the cult is the "natural flowering"³ of the Gospel devotion to the loving Person of Jesus (as above explained).

¹ A.A.S., p. 339. C.T.S., trans., n. 50 f.

² J. Bainvel, *Devotion to the Sacred Heart*, trans. E. Leahy, New York, 1924.

³ A.A.S., p. 340. C.T.S., trans., n. 52.

The liturgy of the Church includes both practices, the context determining which is being used. For instance, when during the Divine Praises we say "Blessed be His most Sacred Heart", our worship is obviously directed to the physical heart as the symbol of love. On other occasions, however, when we attribute *personal* activities (hearing, etc.) to "the Sacred Heart" why not take the words as synonymous with "our loving Saviour"? Thus, when at the end of Mass we say "Most Sacred Heart of Jesus, have mercy on us," does the official devotion forbid us to say this prayer simply to the loving Person of Jesus? From explanations already given it would not appear so.

In summary, then, we have seen that *Haurietis Aquas* principally stresses devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus as the symbol of His threefold love. The Encyclical, however, appears to recognize also a "simplified devotion", which directly envisages the loving Person of Christ and indirectly His heart of flesh. In this latter practice the title "Sacred Heart" is applied to the whole Christ by a figure of speech called "synecdoche" (the use of a part for the whole)—as when St John said: "The Word was made Flesh [i.e. Man]."

It has also been explained how the Gospel and traditional practices of the devotion are closely related, and mutually react so as to support and intensify each other.

Finally, the following statement of the Encyclical seems to suggest that—if we wish—we may at any time legitimately pass from one practice of the devotion to the other:

We are unquestionably justified in contemplating and venerating the Heart of the Divine Redeemer as the striking image of His charity, as the witness of our Redemption and as a mystical Jacob's ladder by which we climb up to the embrace of "God our Saviour" [i.e. the loving Person of Christ].¹

T. V. FLEMING, S.J.

¹ *A.A.S.*, p. 328. *C.T.S.*, trans., n. 28. Throughout this article "the person of Christ" signifies "the whole Christ", i.e. *persona composita* (St Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, 3, 2, 4) or *Totus Christus caro, anima, Deus* (St Augustine, *P.L.*, 38, 1206). Other aspects of the foregoing interpretation of the devotion are contained in my pre-encyclical "Simplified Devotion to the Sacred Heart", *Theological Studies*, 16 (1955), pp. 270-4.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

THE quite recent publication of a wholly new and up-to-date *Introduction à la Bible*, prepared under the direction of the late M. André Robert and of M. André Feuillet, professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Paris Institut Catholique, is an event of great interest to all Catholic students of Holy Scripture.¹ It almost coincides with the appearance of a memorial volume to the senior editor under the title of *Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert*, to which fifty-eight scholars have contributed essays and which includes an excellent photograph by way of frontispiece, a short biographical notice, and a full bibliography. A sketch of the career of the junior editor may be found in the fourth volume of *Catholicisme*, at columns 1241-2.

The present volume is the work of ten writers in all, from among whom one may mention the Oratorian Fr P. Auvray, M. H. Cazelles, who succeeded M. Robert in the chair of Old Testament studies in Paris, M. J. Gelin of the Lyon faculty, and Mgr H. Lusseau, *doyen* of the Angers faculty. In a preface to this volume, Mgr Jean Weber, the Bishop of Strasbourg, welcomes a volume on this scale and of this character, while foreseeing that there may be some surprises in store for readers accustomed "à utiliser des espèces de 'compendia', résumant brièvement, plus ou moins heureusement, le résultat des études bibliques. . . ."

On consulting the various select bibliographies, more particularly those at p. 2 (*Bibliographie générale*) and at p. 214 (*Introductions à l'Ancien Testament*) it is apparent that, since 1949, there have been published no less than eight Catholic works containing general introductions to the Bible, ranging from Abbot B. Gut's revision of Dom H. Höpfl's *Introductio generalis in sacram scripturam* in 1950 down to the Italian symposium entitled *Secoli sul mondo*, edited by G. Rinaldi in 1955. By contrast with this, only four recent works by Catholics on Old

¹ Tome I: *Introduction Générale. Ancien Testament*. Tournai, Desclée & Cie, 1957. Pp. xxv + 850. Price £1 18s. 6d. (in cloth).

Testament introduction are listed, namely, the Latin works by Dom A. Miller and Dom A. Metzinger (*Introductio specialis in V.T.*) and by Simón-Prado (*Praelectiones Biblicae*, 5th ed., Rome and Turin, 1946), the third edition of *Initiation biblique* (1954) and the 6th edition of Père J. Renié, S.M., *Manuel d'Écriture Sainte* (Paris-Lyon, 1949). It may be claimed that the present book is, on the whole, more agreeable for reading than the Latin works just mentioned, a great deal fuller than *Initiation Biblique*, and at once more progressive and more constructive than Renié's *Manuel*. It might in fact be compared, very much to its advantage, with the French translation by Mazoyer of the Cornely-Merk *Compendium*.

The first section of the general introduction, after a short chapter on faith in the inspired books, as shown in the two Testaments and in the Patristic age, approaches the subject of scriptural inspiration by way of a short history; this is followed by sub-sections on inspiration and the psychology of the sacred writers, and inspiration in relation to the writing of the books of Scripture. One of the topics here discussed interestingly is that of the Septuagint's inspired character, with reference to recent studies by Benoit and Auvray in which the idea of an *inspiration d'ensemble* is suggested. No doubt the authors of these pages are right in thinking that the question calls for further study before it can be finally settled. There follows a concise account of the Canons of the Old and the New Testaments. In regard to the criterion of canonicity the authors conclude that Lagrange's suggestions on apostolic origin are hardly sufficient; they would say that the sole objective and adequate criterion is the revelation made by the Holy Spirit to the Church of God and transmitted by apostolic tradition. Some concluding pages discuss the extent of canonicity and inspiration, affirming the truth that the Church accepts the inspiration of all Scripture in its entirety, and that the whole Bible is indeed the word of God.

The question of the inerrancy of Scripture is treated with special lucidity and candour. In applying the principles established to difficulties of the moral order it is emphasized that: "La Bible rapporte une *pédagogie* divine, et une *pédagogie progressive*" (p. 62). On scientific questions, there is, as might be expected, a rejection of concordantism, which obliged the up-

hold
devel
quote
souch
chan
C
allow
Bibli
cum,
histor
in Sp
both
histor
envis
the s
des a
péno
but d
de N
A
the c
intro
genre
on li
S
critic
versi
and
the
histo
Chri
comp
V
quar
with
Bible
volu
com
hun

holders of that system to adapt their commentaries to the development of scientific theories. A delightful sentence is quoted from Père Prat's *Bible et histoire*: "Moïse, obstinément soucieux de se tenir au courant, docile aux maîtres de l'heure, changeait d'avis en deux éditions d'un même commentaire."

On inerrancy in matters of history the authors rightly disallow any wholesale use of the principles laid down by the Biblical Commission's reply of 23 June 1905 (*Enchiridion Biblicum*, 1954 ed., sect. 161): *De narrationibus specietenus tantum historicis*. . . . Such a use was condemned by Pope Benedict XV in *Spiritus Paraclitus* (EB sect. 456 f.) and ignores the fact that both Judaism and Christianity are linked inextricably with history. Yet the essentially *religious* angle from which the Bible envisages the facts that it teaches points to the conclusion that the sacred authors "dans bien des cas pouvaient s'en tenir à des approximations où bien des détails étaient laissés dans le pénombre. Pour les lecteurs du livre de Daniel, étant donné le but de l'oeuvre, il était bien indifférent que Balthazar fût le fils de Nabuchodonosor ou de son successeur" (p. 65).

A final section on the *genres littéraires* and the expression of the divine thought and intention rounds off appropriately the introductory papers on *les livres inspirés*. The problem of the *genres* is taken up again in greater detail in the pages (121-51) on literary criticism.

Section II of the introduction considers "Les règles de critique rationnelle" and has chapters on the Biblical text, the versions of the Old and New Testaments, and textual, literary and historical criticism. Section III (pp. 169-212) is devoted to the Catholic interpretation of the sacred books. It traces the history of Biblical exegesis back to Judaism and through the Christian centuries, and, as was to be expected, includes a compressed account of the senses of Holy Scripture.

We may now refer to the major part of the book, the three-quarters of it that deal with the Old Testament. This opens with some preliminary chapters on "Le Cadre Historique de la Bible" or, in terms of Professor N. H. Baynes's admirable volume, published in 1927, *Israel amongst the Nations*. After this comes the outstanding portion of the whole work, M. Cazelles' hundred-page survey of Pentateuchal criticism, perhaps the

most attractive brief presentation of a subject that often loses itself in details. After a chapter on the literary aspect of the Pentateuch, calling attention to the breaks in the narrative, the repetitions and doublets, and the vocabulary and style, M. Cazelles turns to the history of the critical study of the five books, first from patristic times down to the eighteenth century, when Astruc, developing still further Witter's observations, concluded to a significant variation in the use of the divine names in Genesis and the first two chapters of Exodus. So, by way of Eichhorn, Hupfeld and Graf to Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) and the system initiated in his *Prologomena to the History of Israel* which has remained for many decades the dominant critical hypothesis, even though, as M. Cazelles comments, there has always been some opposition to it and it has never completely triumphed over other systems. M. Cazelles excellently summarizes the weaknesses of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis—its rejection of the supernatural, its inadequate information regarding the world of the ancient East, and its failure to determine sufficiently the *genre littéraire* of the various parts that make up the Pentateuch as a whole. The author explains the opposition to the system and the attempts made at the turn of the century by some prominent Catholic scholars, such as Lagrange, Prat and Durand, to take what is best in the system, while rejecting what is inadequate and perverse. Then come the intervention of the Church's *magisterium*, the answers to difficulties given by the Biblical Commission (founded by Leo XIII in 1902) and the influence upon Pentateuchal studies of archaeological discoveries in the Near East between 1890 and 1914. A chapter is devoted to the school of form-criticism, initiated in 1895 by Hermann Gunkel in his book *Schöpfung und Chaos*, the results of which were developed by such writers as J. Hempel and G. von Rad. Chapter V (*Données actuelles conditionnant l'étude du Pentateuque*) considers recent archaeological findings, new ways of approach to the problem, and attempts at new solutions (including such a system as that of the late Dr. Paul Heinisch, which seems to be a revival of Ewald's "theory of complements"). Meanwhile increasing guidance has been given by the Church by means of the encyclicals *Divino afflante* (30 September 1943) and *Humani Generis* (12 August 1950) and of

Père Vosté's letter to Cardinal Suhard (16 January 1948). The final chapter on the contents and the theology of the Pentateuch describes in some detail the characteristics of the four main documents (J, E, D and P). All in all, this is a convincing and striking account, the best possible preparation for the study of the remaining Old Testament books, and for the concluding section by P. Grelot on *The Growth of the Old Testament* (the title of Professor H. H. Rowley's excellent manual in "Hutchinson's University Library", published in 1950).

The present age being, among other things, an age of Bible translations, it is a pleasure to welcome the one-volume edition of the already celebrated *Bible de Jérusalem*, which was issued originally in forty-three small fascicles between 1948 and 1954. It may be recalled that one of the guiding principles for this bible was the creation of two committees, one to direct the making of the translations by a body of thirty-three scholars, and a second, smaller group, to arrange for the publication in one volume. Each fascicle, too, was subjected to a twofold revision, first by another Biblical expert, and secondly by a university professor or other writer who would have an eye to the literary excellence of the rendering, and would keep in mind the needs of all readers at the present time. Since the last fascicle appeared in 1954, a further work of revision has been carried out. First, the translation itself has been improved by many changes in matters of detail, though it remains substantially as it was in the separate fascicles. An attempt has been made to secure uniformity of expression, in cases where the same Greek or Hebrew word had been rendered in various ways. In the versions of parallel texts every effort has been concentrated on bringing out both the likenesses and the differences to be found in the two texts.

The notes also differ in some respects from those found in the forty-three fascicles. Various details of textual criticism and literary criticism, some historical information, and some remarks about extra-Biblical documents have perforce been eliminated. By way of compensation some pains have been taken to prepare a number of *notes-clefs* which will say, once for all, what needs to be said on a particular point, and to which cross-references can be given wherever these are required. A *table alphabétique*

des notes les plus importantes (pp. 1662-9) helps to unify this scheme. The introductions to the separate books are given in an abridged form at the beginning of each book or group of books.

Marginal references are a strong feature of the present volume.¹ For the understanding of these it is essential to read all the information listed under "Références marginales" on p. xiii. When a Biblical book cites another Biblical text the words quoted are printed in italics, and a marginal reference to their place of origin is given. Two or three conventional *sigla* (horizontal or vertical lines, an arrow-head, etc.) are fully explained and should prove quite easy to remember. The type selected is rather small (by contrast with the delightful style used in the separate fascicles for texts and introductions) but is sufficiently clear. The *errata*-slip comprises more than a hundred items.

The *Bible de Jérusalem* is also published in a most useful pocket edition.² For the benefit of those who delight in exact measurements it may be said that, whereas the large one-volume edition measures $8\frac{3}{4}$ by $6\frac{1}{4}$ inches and weighs 4 lb., the pocket edition measures 5 by $3\frac{1}{4}$ inches and weighs $9\frac{1}{2}$ oz. The extremely small type, which appears to correspond to nonpareil (six point) is also perfectly legible. The text exactly agrees with that of the large edition, but the notes have, naturally enough, been reduced to a minimum, exactly 180 pages of the work (105 for O.T. and 75 for N.T.), arranged in two sets of continuous pages. There is also a seven-page index to the more important notes.

From a vest-pocket edition of the *Bible de Jérusalem* it is easy to turn to an almost equally compressed edition of the *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis juxta PP. Clementis VIII decretum*, edited by Gianfranco Nolli, with a preface by P. Alberto Vaccari, S.J.³ It should be added that the compression refers to the measurements of each volume ($5\frac{1}{2}$ by $3\frac{3}{4}$ inches) and not to the combined weight of the four little volumes, which is approximately 2 lb. 5 oz. In his preface to the first volume (Genesis-

¹ *La Sainte Bible, traduite en français, sous la direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem*. Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1956. Pp. 1669 (+ 8 pp. of maps). Price (in cloth) 1800 francs.

² Edition du Cerf, 1955. Pp. 1989. Price £1.

³ Rome, Officium Libri Catholici (Catholic Book Agency), 1955. Four volumes (pp. 1172 + 1023 + 1291 + 806). Price £4 14s. 6d.

4 Kings) P. Vaccari calls attention to the handiness and portability of the volumes, which are also (*ad frustula temporis redimenta*) designed to open very easily. The volume containing the Psalter has the two texts (Gallican Version and version of 1945) printed on opposing pages. The New Testament volume gives not only the Vulgate Latin, but the Greek text of P. Augustine Merk's edition, accompanied by an *apparatus criticus* that provides not only variant readings, but short notes on morphology and syntax. The somewhat high cost of these volumes may lead some readers to prefer the less expensive one-volume editions of Grammatica and Colunga-Turrado (to mention no others) but there can be no doubt that this is the only *édition de poche* of the Latin Vulgate at present on the market.

JOHN M. T. BARTON

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

DUPLICATION OF EASTER COMMUNION

When, as may happen, the interval between legal midnight and solar midnight is such as to make it possible for those who assist at an Easter Vigil Mass, begun at legal midnight, to communicate before solar midnight has arrived, may they communicate again (or celebrate Mass) on the Easter morning? (S. F. B.)

REPLY

Canon 857: "Nemini liceat sanctissimam Eucharistiam recipere, qui eam eadem die iam receperit, nisi in casibus de quibus in can. 858, §1."

This question has twice been answered in these columns, though *en passant*, as part of the answer to a wider question.¹ In both cases, an affirmative answer was confidently given on the basis of canon 33 which, as authentically interpreted, allows one to change from one legitimate reckoning of time to another,

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, August 1953, p. 490; June 1956, p. 360.

in formally distinct acts.¹ We resume the question here, partly because this is the first time that it has been put to us directly, and partly because the reasons for doubting the affirmative answer deserve to be discussed. Canonically, i.e. viewed as a straightforward application of the canonical rules for the reckoning of time, the affirmative answer remains sound enough; but liturgically, i.e. viewed against the background of the restored discipline of Holy Week, it seems rather less secure.

One of the outstanding features of this discipline is the return to the liturgical character of Holy Saturday which, "praecoci paschali gaudio invasus, propriam indolem perdidit luctuosam memoriae dominicae sepulturae".² Henceforth it is to be "dies summi luctus, quo Ecclesia ad sepulcrum Domini immoratur, passionem eius et mortem meditando; a sacrificio Missae, sacra mensa denudata, abstinendo; usque dum, post solemnem vigiliam seu nocturnam Resurrectionis expectationem, locus detur gaudiis paschalibus, quorum abundantia in sequentes dies exundat".³ In exceptional circumstances, "ubi urgeat vera necessitas", the local Ordinary is authorized to allow particular churches to begin the vigil ceremony at sunset and thereby to have Mass and Communion while it is still, by any chronological reckoning, Saturday;⁴ but, in principle, there is to be neither Mass nor Communion for anyone until, with the arrival of midnight, the day of mourning is over and the day of paschal rejoicing has actually begun.

No one doubts the right of those who communicate at a legitimately anticipated vigil to communicate again on Easter Day; they do so in virtue of an exceptional provision, expressly made by the Ordinary, and there is no question of their communicating twice on the same day, contrary to the rule of canon 857. But can the same be said with equal confidence of those whose Easter Communion is antedated to Holy Saturday, not in virtue of an express and exceptional provision (which the Church is clearly reluctant to grant), but simply in virtue of a

¹ Code Commission, 29 May 1947 (*A.A.S.*, 1947, XXXIX, p. 373): "An, electo uno temporis supputandi modo, hic, vi can. 33, §1, in actionibus formaliter diversis, mutari possit. R./Affirmative."

² *S.R.C.* decree *Maxima*, 16 November 1955.

³ Instruction appended to the decree *Maxima*, I, 2, d.

⁴ *S.R.C.*, *Ordinationes et Declarationes*, 1 February 1957, V, 19, b, c.

sufficient local difference in the legal and solar reckonings of midnight? The situation will not arise in England, this Easter (1958), because "summer time" will not be operative until afterwards; but there are countries, such as France, where it will be possible every year for the vigil Communion, liturgically attached to Easter Sunday, to be assigned chronologically to Holy Saturday. Does the Church intend that, wherever this occurs, the faithful in general shall be entitled to a double Easter Communion, without the special permission which she so grudgingly concedes in other cases? As we have seen above, the change from one legitimate reckoning to another is permitted only "in actionibus formaliter diversis". Can the two Communions be called formally distinct in this instance, when the liturgy provides for only one?

We are not sure of the answer, and have broached the question mainly to show that the issue is not as simple as it might at first appear. However, *in dubiis libertas*. Until, therefore, the question is solved authentically or by a general consensus of opinion, we think the affirmative answer sufficiently probable to be followable with a safe conscience.

JOINT PRAYER WITH NON-CATHOLICS

The Holy Office Instruction on the Œcumenical Movement, 20 December 1949, while forbidding "any kind of *communicatio in sacris*" at mixed "reunion" meetings, permits them to be opened or closed with prayers "approved by the Catholic Church". (a) In view of this permission of the Holy See, is it within the competence of an Ordinary, having allowed the meeting, to forbid the use of such prayers at it? (b) Does this permission introduce a new principle in regard to *communicatio in sacris*, as hitherto understood by approved authors? Can it be taken as indicating that the Holy See would favour joint prayer where danger of *communicatio in sacris* can be excluded, e.g. at an open-air armistice service? (c) How is the phrase "approved by the Catholic Church" to be understood? (d) What circumstance must be present to make the joint prayer of Catholics and non-Catholics *communicatio in sacris*? (H. St J.)

REPLY

Canon 1258, §1: "Haud licitum est fidelibus quovis modo active assistere seu partem habere in sacris acatholicorum."

Holy Office Instruction, 20 December 1949, §V: "Quamquam in omnibus hisce conventibus et collationibus (i.e. of Catholics with non-Catholics, to promote "reunion") quaelibet in sacris communicatio est devitanda, tamen non reprobat communis recitatio Orationis Dominicae vel precationis ab Ecclesia Catholica approbata, qua iidem conventus aperiantur et concludantur."¹

(a) Under the common law of canon 1325, §2, Catholics may not convene with non-Catholics to discuss religious differences on level terms, without leave of the Holy See, or, in urgent cases, the local Ordinary. In §IV of the above-mentioned Instruction, Ordinaries were given a faculty, valid for three years from 31 January 1950, to supply the requisite leave for *local* meetings. We gather that it was not renewed up to 1956.² But whether an Ordinary permits a meeting by special faculty, or by the common law provision in urgent cases, we consider it to be certainly within his competence to stipulate that there shall be no joint prayers, not even those mentioned in the Instruction. True, he cannot forbid what the Holy See *positively* permits, but the Instruction can scarcely be said to have given the faithful a positive right in common law to joint recitation of the *Pater*, etc., at "reunion" meetings; it merely informs Ordinaries, in the course of outlining their duty of vigilance, that such recitation is "not reprobated", which is a very different thing.³

Moreover, the clear object of the whole Instruction is to confirm rather than to limit the competence of local Ordinaries. It places the "reunion" movement, at the diocesan level, under their meticulous supervision and control: "*Quoad modum ratio-*

¹ A.A.S., 1950, XLII, p. 146; THE CLERGY REVIEW, April 1950, p. 274.

² Conway, *Problems in Canon Law*, p. 333, footnote 2.

³ A. Delmée, in *Apollinaris*, 1950, XXIII, p. 100, does not appear to appreciate the difference. He writes: "S. Congregatio S. Officii non tantum non reprobat recitationem communem Orationis Dominicae, sed insuper positive permittit omnem aliam orationem ab Ecclesia approbatam."

nemque hoc in labore procedendi, Episcopi ipsi, quatenus praestanda sint, quatenus vero evitanda, praescribent, eaque ab omnibus observanda curabunt" (§ II); and declares that for mixed "reunion" meetings, in particular, "singulari prorsus Ordinariorum vigilantia et moderamine opus est" (§III). In this context, it is difficult to see how §V can be read as a limitation of their authority. Everything suggests that it is merely for their guidance.

(b) Nor can we see that it has introduced any new principle in regard to *communicatio in sacris*, as hitherto understood by approved authors. It may be interpreted as a dispensation from the law of canon 1258, §1, and therefore as confirming the opinion of those who hold that the absoluteness of the prohibition is of ecclesiastical rather than natural law;¹ or it may be explained as a mere application of the common teaching of authors about the lawfulness of *private* prayer with non-Catholics,² or as a declaration that approved Catholic prayers, recited jointly with non-Catholics at the beginning and end of meetings of the kind envisaged, are not *sacra acatholicorum* in the sense of the canon;³ but, whichever of these interpretations is correct, there is question of a particular ruling, rather than of a new principle. It is seldom safe to argue from the particular to the general, and, in this instance, any such argument would seem to be excluded by the negative character of the concession ("non reprobat") and by the general tenor of the Instruction, which is more concerned to safeguard against the danger of indifferentism than to open the door to a wider liberty. We doubt therefore whether one can safely conclude, at least from this particular text, that the Holy See would actually favour the joint recitation of orthodox and approved prayers on such occasions as open-air armistice services; at most, one might infer that it would not certainly object.

We do not deny that the danger of *communicatio in sacris* can be excluded on such occasions; indeed, a staff theologian of *L'Ami du clergé* seems to think that it is normally excluded. Observing that, in countries of divided religious allegiance like

¹ Mahoney, *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, June 1950, p. 398.

² Conway, *op. cit.*, p. 334.

³ *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, May 1957, p. 300; Hürth, *Periodica*, XXXIX, p. 208.

Switzerland and the U.S.A., Catholic priests regularly assist with Protestant ministers at civic and patriotic ceremonies, he sees no reason why they should not recite the *Pater* together, since "it is, in any case, a mere matter of a non-official prayer which none of the priests or ministers regards as a liturgical function".¹ We doubt whether the issue is quite as simple in this country, where a jointly recited *Pater* would commonly be an appendage to (if not an integral part of) an official service conducted by a minister of the Established Church; but, even supposing that *communicatio in sacris* has been safely excluded, there remain other considerations of public moment which may reasonably move the local Ordinary to rule "non expedit".²

(c) "... vel precationis ab Ecclesia Catholica approbatæ." Taken in its strict and proper sense, this phrase would seem to refer to prayers approved by the Holy See or local Ordinary for public use, since it is only such prayers that require formal approval;³ and presumably it was used as a practical means of ensuring that the prayers used shall be orthodox. We do not therefore conclude that the use of an orthodox prayer, not formally approved, is unlawful; but we suggest that the proper procedure, in such a case, would be to obtain the approval of the local Ordinary under whose control the meeting is to be held.

(d) As to the circumstances in which the joint prayer of Catholics and non-Catholics becomes *communicatio in sacris*, it should be remembered that this term has a moral as well as a juridical sense.⁴ In the juridical sense, it means participation in a liturgical function conducted by a minister of religion acting as such. In the moral sense, it extends to any act of religious worship performed by a non-Catholic, acting as a member of his sect and worshipping according to it, in which a Catholic participates in such a manner as to indicate or imply that he makes this form of worship his own, at least for this occasion. Either set of circumstances is sufficient to make joint prayer

¹ Ph.D., *Ami du clergé*, 13 June 1957, p. 381.

² Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Iuris Canonici*, II (ed. 1954), n. 576: "Si communis quaedam gentis laetitia celebranda sit, catholici conentur separatas sollemnitates sacras instaurare potius quam se acatholicis adiungant."

³ Canon 1259.

⁴ Cf. Hürth, loc. cit.

communicatio in sacris and forbidden. Neither set is present in the non-liturgical recitation of the *Pater*, or other approved prayer, at the beginning of a meeting convened for discussion rather than for worship.

THE CENSURE AGAINST THEATRE-GOING BY
THE CLERGY

A censure can be inflicted only for an external, grave, consummated and contumacious *delictum* (canon 2242, §1). As a rule, people in this country regard theatre-going as a morally lawful form of recreation and would not be shocked by the attendance of the clergy at respectable theatrical performances. How then can a censure still be attached to an action which is no longer, objectively speaking, a canonical *delictum*, i.e. an externally grave offence? (H.)

REPLY

Canon 2242, §1: "Censura punitur tantummodo delictum externum, grave, consummatum, cum contumacia coniunctum. . . ."

Canon 2195, §1: "Nomine delicti, iure ecclesiastico, intelligitur externa et moraliter imputabilis legis violatio cui addita sit sanctio canonica saltem indeterminata."

Conc. Prov. Westm. IV, decr. XI, n. 9: "Abstineant sacerdotes a spectaculis viro ecclesiastico indignis. . . . Prohibemus insuper districte ne ecclesiastici sacris ordinibus initiati scenicis spectaculis in publicis theatris, vel in locis theatri publici usui ad tempus inservientibus, intersint, imponentes transgressoribus poenam suspensionis ipso facto incurrendam, hactenus ubique in Anglia vigentem, cum reservatione respectivo Ordinario."

There is an implicit assumption in the question, as phrased, that clerical theatre-going was originally forbidden under censure by the synodal law, because it was regarded at that time as objectively a gravely reprehensible practice, deserving of canonical censure. There are surely no grounds for this assumption. The synodal Fathers cannot have been unaware that then,

as now, theatrical performances varied between the gravely reprehensible and the morally irreproachable. They dealt with the former in the opening sentence of the above-quoted decree, being content simply to remind the clergy of their natural moral obligation to "abstain from spectacles unworthy of an ecclesiastic". In then proceeding to debar them from public theatrical performances generally, they clearly realized, as the word "insuper" indicates, that they were imposing an obligation not demanded by the natural moral law. They may have envisaged it as a precaution against abuses, though it is more complimentary to the contemporary clergy to suppose that the primary object was to set the clergy a higher standard of ascetical detachment from worldly pursuits; but, whatever their primary motive may have been, it is clear that clerical theatre-going was not forbidden *ratione peccati*, but *ratione boni communis spiritualis*.

The question therefore resolves itself to whether or not an intrinsically innocent act can be forbidden under pain of grave sin and become thereby a legitimate object of canonical censure. The answer is quite certain. An intrinsically innocent act can be forbidden under pain of grave sin, if a grave prohibition is necessary or notably useful to the common good. The married state, to mention but one example, is not only intrinsically innocent, but sanctified by a sacrament; yet the Church has not hesitated to forbid it to major clerics, for reasons of the common good, under pain of grave sin, censure and even invalidity. The synodal Fathers were apparently satisfied that the exclusion of the clergy from attendance at public theatrical performances of any kind would contribute notably to the spiritual good of the Church in this country, and for that reason they forbade all such attendance under pain of grave sin and censure. Their action was approved by the Holy See.¹

It is irrelevant to object that, nowadays, people would not be shocked by the presence of the clergy at respectable theatrical performances. As far as we know, the same was true when the law was made. But, in any case, a law does not cease to bind merely because of a change of public opinion regarding its object. It ceases only when its purpose becomes completely

¹ S.C.P.F., 14 May 1853; 24 July 1874.

unattainable for the community as a whole (i.e. in this case, for the clergy) and is likely to remain completely unattainable.¹ Some may feel that the theatre law is stricter than the achievement of its purpose requires, but no one can reasonably claim that it has become completely and permanently purposeless.

L. L. McR.

LEONINE PRAYERS

May the Leonine Prayers after a private Mass be omitted in an oratory? It appears they were prescribed for churches only. (P. C. B.)

REPLY

In 1859 owing to the troubled state of affairs in Europe, especially in regard to the Church, Pius IX ordered certain prayers to be recited after private Masses in the then Papal States. Leo XIII in 1884 extended this prescription to the Universal Church, substituting the prayer *Deus refugium nostrum* for the four short prayers ordered by Pius IX, and in it begging aid "in presentibus necessitatibus". The form of the prayer was changed to "pro conversione peccatorum, pro libertate et exaltatione sanctae Matris Ecclesiae" in 1886 and the invocation of St Michael—composed by Leo XIII himself—was added. In 1897 the same Pontiff allowed the Divine Praises to be recited in addition, and in 1904 S. Pius X permitted the threefold invocation to the Sacred Heart also. These prayers for the needs of the Church were re-imposed by S. Pius X in 1903 and Benedict XV in 1915. After the Lateran Treaty (1929) Pius XI in a Consistorial Allocution of 30 June 1930 ordered the prayers to be offered for Russia.

It is true that in the original decree of Leo XIII the prayers are ordered "in omnibus ecclesiis" with no mention of oratories, and so certain theologians like Jone² and canonists like Regatillo

¹ Cf. Genicot-Gortebecke, *Instit. Theol. Mor.*, I, 147; Noldin, *Summa Theol. Mor.*, I, n. 199.

² *Katholische Moraal-Théologie* (1953 edition, p. 548).

S.J.,¹ while pointing out that the prayers are certainly of obligation in public oratories—since, by C.J.C. canon 1191¹, such oratories are ruled by the same laws as churches—are of the opinion that the recitation of the Leonine prayers is optional in semi-public and private oratories, and in Masses celebrated outside a church (e.g. in the open air). *Questions Liturgiques* (1954, p. 147) seems to approve of this view and so does the 1957 Benedictine *Ordo* for St Paul's basilica in Rome.

The opinion of Jone and Regatillo gave rise to an article in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, a very authoritative Roman periodical, in its first issue of 1955 (pp. 54 *sqq.*), written, apparently, by Fr I. Pizzoni, C.M., a consultor of the S. Congregation of Rites and Director of the Pontifical Liturgical Academy (Rome). He argues that canon 1191¹ does not apply to such prayers as the Leonine ones but is applicable only to liturgical *functions* such as those of Candlemas or Ash Wednesday; and he points out that S.R.C. in the various decisions it has given since 1886 on the omission of the Leonine prayers has never made any distinction between a private Mass celebrated in a church and that said in a semi-public or private oratory. He thinks that in view of the important intention for which the prayers are said they ought not to be omitted—except, of course, in the cases when their omission is allowed by official decision of S.R.C.² or the opinion of approved rubricians—in oratories.

It may be added that: (a) the phrase “in omnibus ecclesiis” was used at a time when the distinction laid down by the Code of Canon Law between churches and oratories of different kinds was not so clear-cut as it is now; (b) it would seem that a custom *praeter legem* of saying the Leonine prayers in all oratories has now created a law requiring their recitation.

Liturgists are, generally speaking, opposed to the permanent addition of any prayers to the central act of the Liturgy, where they are anomalous—and this is marked by the fact that the priest is directed to say the Leonine prayers kneeling, to mark their distinction from the Mass—and are desirous that these Leonine prayers be abolished by the Holy See.

¹ *Jus Sacramentarium* (1949, n. 182); *Theologiae Moralis Summa* (1954, III, n. 183); *Sal Terrae* (November 1944).

² E.g. S.R.C., 3697², 3936², 4177², 4271², 4305.

SINGING IN ENGLISH AT MASS

May anything be sung in English during Mass, e.g., a motet during the Offertory? (M. M.)

REPLY

The basic rule about singing in the vernacular at Mass is the principle enunciated in the *Motu Proprio* of S. Pius X on Church music (1903), §7, which reads: "The language of the Latin Church is Latin, and in solemn liturgical functions all singing in the vernacular is completely forbidden; *a fortiori* the singing in the vernacular of the variable or common parts of the Mass or Office."¹ This law was not new, it had been given in the Instruction of Leo XIII about music in 1894² and in different replies of S.R.C. both before and after that date.³ In "strictly liturgical functions" a vernacular text may neither replace a Latin text or be interpolated into the function. In the Encyclical *Musicae Sacrae Disciplina* (25 December 1955) the present Pope repeats the law. By "solemn liturgical function" is meant (for Mass) not only high Mass but also sung Mass,⁴ and a motet in English may not be sung at the Offertory in such a Mass, but may be sung before or immediately after Mass.⁵

Pius XII made one exception in his Encyclical. "Wherever ancient or immemorial custom permits the singing of popular hymns in the vernacular after the sacred liturgical words have been sung in Latin at solemn Mass, Ordinaries may allow that to continue 'if they judge that because of circumstances of place and persons such customs cannot prudently be suppressed';⁶ but the rule forbidding the chanting of the liturgical phrases in

¹ S.R.C., 4121.

² S.R.C., 3830¹, 7, 8.

³ S.R.C., 3113¹, 3230, 3496¹, 3827¹, 3880, 3975⁸, 3994¹.

⁴ S.R.C., 1 June 1956.

⁵ S.R.C., 7 March 1956.

⁶ The Pope is here quoting the general canon law, Code, canon 5 (which, however, reads "tolerari poterunt", which is stronger than "may allow").

the vernacular must remain in force, as was said above."¹ The bishops of Germany and Austria when they submitted the question of their *Betsingmesse* (at which the people make the Mass responses in Latin but sing other texts in German) received the reply "Benignissime toleretur" (*S.R.C.*, 1943, and Holy Office, April 1955). This was because the practice was governed by the exception later to be stated in the Pope's Encyclical.

During low Mass, however, hymns in the vernacular are allowed, "provided they are rightly adapted to each part of the Sacrifice".² Leo XIII had already permitted this in functions other than strictly liturgical ones,³ and a subsequent decision of *S.R.C.* confirmed this "with the consent of the Ordinary".⁴ This latter is no longer needed in view of the general permission given in Pius XII's Encyclical.

Another restriction must, however, be remembered: it is never allowed to sing an actual translation of any Latin text from the Mass such as an Introit, Communion antiphon, or hymn like *Lauda Sion*;⁵ and this restriction is evidently still in force in view of the words of the Encyclical quoted above about "liturgical phrases". Accordingly, while singing in the vernacular during low Mass should be "adapted to each part of the Sacrifice" it must not be a straightforward version of the actual liturgical text.

J. B. O'C.

BOOK REVIEWS

A History of the Council of Trent. By Hubert Jedin. Translated from the German by Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B. Vol. I. Pp. xi + 618. (Nelson. 70s.)

Up till now there has been no adequate history of the Council of Trent. It seems odd that this should be so, when Trent is the force that has moulded the modern Church. Yet is it so surprising? The

¹ Unofficial translation of the Encyclical issued by the Vatican Press (p. 15).

² Encyclical, p. 18.

³ *S.R.C.*, 3830¹, 9.

⁴ *S.R.C.*, 3880.

⁵ *S.R.C.*, 4235⁹ (cf. 3537⁹).

very size of Trent makes the writing of its history a deterring task; a man must be a polymath to deal competently with all the matters involved. Again, until the Vatican Archives were opened, important sources were not available. This latter difficulty was removed some time ago, and now at long last the Council has found in Professor Jedin a man courageous and erudite enough to be its historian.

It seems almost an impertinence in an ordinary reviewer to praise a work such as this. In the original German the first volume, now translated, was acknowledged as an outstanding achievement. This history will, in fact, simply take its place as one of the great historical works of our time—a standard work in the full sense of the term. But taking the immense erudition for granted, one must be grateful to the author for so human, so readable and so fascinating a narrative. The preface points out that the book is a book to be read: "This book is written for discerning readers: it needs to be read, not merely dipped into." This advice of the author may be heartily endorsed. The appearance of the bulky tome is indeed formidable, with its pages seemingly so packed with information and so supported with footnotes, and the ordinary mortal may be inclined to dismiss it as for the specialist alone; but anyone with a sense of history, once he has really got into it, will be compelled to finish it. The volume is of imperative importance to scholars; it is also a well-written account of an interesting, complicated but absorbing story. The translation by Dom Ernest Graf is excellent.

Only with the last chapter of this lengthy first volume do we assist at the opening session at Trent. Why so long to reach the Council? The delay reflects the historical reality. Without a knowledge of the long, arduous struggle to bring about the Council and some acquaintance with the forces involved in this, one cannot appreciate properly the setting, the difficulties and the work of Trent. The author has planned his great work in eight books, and this first instalment taking us up to the Council contains the first two. Books III to V will cover the two periods at Trent of 1545-47 and 1551-52, with the interlude at Bologna; Books VI and VII will deal with the great reform Council under Pius IV, and Book VIII with the impact of the Council on the life of the Church.

The first book goes back beyond the outbreak of Protestantism and discusses the period from Basle to the Fifth Lateran Council in regard to two closely connected issues, namely, the relationship between Pope and Council and the movement of reform in the Church. Despite the papal victory after Basle, the conciliar theory still survived. The various movements for a Council of Reform and their origins, together with the papal reaction to them, are examined

in order to clarify the subsequent events that led finally to Trent. The author then looks at the papal attempts at reform. These resulted in 1512 in the Lateran Council. Unfortunately, this last attempt on the eve of the crisis was of little value, but the last chapter of Book I describes the more encouraging picture offered by the spontaneous reform among the members of the Church. These efforts are judged sympathetically and the idea that the Church before roused by Luther was entirely sunk in abuse and superstition is dismissed; nevertheless, whatever seeds of regeneration it contained, this movement of reform did not come to maturity of itself, and to that sad fact the Protestant Reformation owed its success.

The second book opens with an account of Luther and the movement he inaugurated. Luther was condemned by the Pope, but Lutheranism continued. The author gives a good analysis of the reasons for this, and then stresses the confusion that resulted and persisted among Catholics of that time. In these first years no sharply defined cleavage between Protestants and Catholics existed, and "nothing furthered the schism more effectively than the delusion about its actual existence" (p. 191). Moreover, the Protestants were able to enlist for themselves the long frustrated desire for reform. The confusion and the general longing for reform thus made possible the wide diffusion and rapid progress of Luther's movement. And that brings us to the judgement that uncovers for us the tragedy that lies behind the story the author now has to tell:

In the decisive years of the period of the reformation, between 1521 and 1525, there was only one means, humanly speaking, of arresting the movement of secession, viz. a Council—a Council that would lay down with unquestionable authority the rule of faith for the benefit of the undecided, that would condemn those who had fallen away and strengthen those who remained faithful, a Council that would not only prescribe reform but would find ways and means to carry it through (p. 192).

Why the delay? Why did the remedy come so late, too late? Nothing less than the next ten chapters is enough to answer that question. Through them we follow the vicissitudes of the twenty-five-year struggle for a Council. With remarkable skill the author depicts the different forces, political and ecclesiastical, and their interplay; he recounts the advances and the checks, the fruitless negotiations and the gleams of hope. The reader relives it all and aches for the Council and finally experiences that mixture of unbelief and relief with which Christendom came to the realization that the Council was actually going to meet.

The riches of this volume defy the telling. To select but a few. A shrewd but balanced judgement is given on the various Popes and on the other personages involved. There is an account of the formation of the pre-Tridentine controversial theology that makes the theologian look forward to the handling of the theological issues of Trent. The author possesses and imparts an insight into the curial mentality and organization of the time. Throughout the book one admires the ability shown to make clear the implications of a situation or an event. Above all, Professor Jedin combines in himself the impartiality and impeccable scholarship of a true historian with a religious feeling, a concern for the issues he is handling. There is a tranquil and controlled but none the less perceptible sensitivity to all that is at stake, which communicates itself to the reader and recreates for him this period of anxiety for the Church. The influence of Trent is so far-reaching that it is a duty for the theologian and the canonist as well as for the historian to read this book. The duty, however, is a pleasure, but more than this, it is a valuable experience.

The Angels and their Mission According to the Fathers of the Church. By Jean Daniélou, S.J. Translated by David Heimann. Pp. x + 118. (The Newman Press. \$2.75.)

THIS translation—and it is a good one—of Fr Daniélou's little book on the angels is very welcome. Recent years have not seen much writing on the angels, and this work, though small, is a quite valuable contribution to angelology. Its interest and its value are due to the freshness of its approach. We are not given here the usual discussions about the nature of these pure spirits, with the speculations about their faculties and their mode of activity. The concern is with the mission of the angels to men; in other words, the part they play in the history of salvation. This approach was the approach of the Fathers, and the book is in fact not a complete treatise but an account of patristic teaching on the subject.

The order of treatment is an historical one. In ten chapters the author follows the role of the angels through the stages in the unfolding economy of salvation. They were there to assist Israel, and they acted in particular as intermediaries in the giving of the Law. Outside of Israel the angels of the nations did their best to check the progress of evil, but success had to await the coming of Christ. At the birth of Christ the multitude of the angelic host rejoices at the coming of the Saviour, and this is one of the two manifestations of the angelic world in the life of Christ that are of particular significance. The other comes at the end of his earthly ministry at the Ascension, the meaning of which is the exaltation of Christ in His

human nature above all the choirs of the immaterial beings. The role of the angels did not cease with Christ and His work; they continue to serve as His ministers. Fr Daniélou sketches the patristic teaching on their relationship to the Church and to the liturgy, and then turns to their ministry for individuals. He develops the clear tradition about the Guardian Angels and then goes on to the assistance given by the angels in the spiritual life and the outstanding part assigned to them at the time of death. The final chapter tells us about the angels and the Second Coming.

The book is a survey of patristic teaching. Its pages contain numerous quotations from the Fathers, so that we have before us their teaching as they expressed it. It is, however, no mere inventory, and the many points are brought together to form a synthesis. Not all the data gathered together have been as yet reflected upon, worked over, and elaborated by theology, and it must be remembered that not all the opinions of the Fathers are equally well-based. It is better to regard this volume not so much as a finished statement on the mission of the angels as the presentation of material from tradition that still has to be studied and developed. May the author's work stimulate further reflexion on this part of angelology; after all, it is the more important.

God the Unknown and Other Essays. By Victor White, O.P., S.T.M.
Pp. viii + 205. (The Harvill Press. 18s.)

It is a pleasure to read these essays of Fr White. They display a calm thoughtfulness, a maturity of personal reflexion and a distinction of style, which offer the reader that satisfying sense of contact with a cultured mind. The essay form, it is true, does not allow an exhaustive treatment of the many problems touched upon, but in Fr White's hands it makes up for this by its freedom from pedantry and its power to stimulate and suggest. The slight but distinguished essay, as well as the academic treatise, has its place in theological writing. The collection contains thirteen essays, grouped into three parts.

The five essays in the first part are chiefly concerned with our knowledge of God and the general task of the theologian. The most important is the second, which has given the book its title. In it the author denies that we have any rational knowledge of God's nature, even a non-quiddative knowledge. His interpretation of St Thomas is the same as that of the late Fr Sertillanges. Not everyone, far from it, will think that the objections against this "agnosticism" have been satisfactorily met. There is an excellent account in another essay of the Platonic tradition in St Thomas. We are told how St Thomas fused together Platonism and Aristotelianism, and the

Platonic element in his thought receives its proper recognition. A more technical essay analyses carefully the setting in the *Summa Theologica* of the Five Ways. The precise import of these has often been missed, because of the failure to examine their context. This preoccupation with background and approach is characteristic of the author. He is convinced, and rightly so, that many discussions are vitiated by a wrong formulation of the problem in question.

Various theological problems are tackled by the essays in the second part. The one on the atonement is not altogether successful. While the author shows well enough that St Thomas had a more balanced view of the redemption than many have allowed, he does not carry conviction when he maintains that a satisfactory synthesis was achieved. It is a pity that St Thomas is so often made the goal rather than the starting-point of thought. On the other hand, the paper on the natural law is good; it will be helpful to non-Catholics who want to understand the Catholic position.

The third part gives us three essays on ecumenical themes. The subjects are the Church Unity Octave, membership of the Church and papal infallibility. The essay on the last point is well done; the author is again concerned with the proper approach to the question, with the need to see it in its proper context. One slight flaw: in his anxiety to reject the idea of "ecclesiastical faith" he gives the impression of restricting unduly the object of infallibility.

It has been possible to mention only some of the essays. Comment might have been made on others. There is much here to think about. This is a book for all who want to read serious theology, but are repelled by the aridity of presentation so frequently found. They are given here solid thought, attractively expressed.

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Edited by F. J. Cross. Pp. xix + 1492. (Oxford University Press. 70s.)

MANY readers will be familiar with one or more of the Oxford *Companions*—perhaps it will be with the very popular one on music. In the same class of one-volume reference books there is also *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, which was published in 1949. The idea of a similar work of reference on the Christian Church naturally suggested itself, and Professor Cross was asked to undertake its preparation. It could not have been an easy task; but it has been carried out admirably, and the scholarship and presentation could hardly be bettered. The Editor has had the help of many scholars. The preface tells us that about half the entries, including most of those of major importance, were prepared by these working independently. Professor Cross and his immediate associates compiled the rest of the

entries and the bibliographies. Although a list of contributors is given at the beginning, the individual articles remain unsigned. This is because the Editor exercised freely his prerogative of modification and reconstruction in order to weld the material into a unified whole. Among the immediate associates of the Editor mentioned by name is Miss Hilda Graef, well known to Catholic readers. The book contains over 6000 entries, and, with the same format as the *Companion to Music*, has 300 more pages.

The main purpose of any work such as this must be to pack as much information as possible within the covers of one volume. What often defeats this purpose is the undue lengthening of certain entries, with the result that the number of entries is reduced or the work carried to excessive length. Professor Cross has avoided this mistake. The entries are usually quite short, and even the major ones are given only a page or two. In that way he has succeeded in giving us a reference dictionary of desk size which contains a seemingly endless amount of factual information on all subjects connected with Christianity. The book has an amazing range, which includes the biblical, historical, doctrinal, liturgical, devotional, biographical and so on. Every student has had the experience of wasting precious time searching for precise information on some point and having to seek it in treatises or lengthy articles in encyclopaedias. Nothing can altogether eliminate such incidents, but this work is certainly an invaluable companion to have at one's side to be consulted quickly and profitably on point after point coming within its scope. The bibliographies are also welcome, though they cater for a less pressing need. They were compiled independently of the entries, and their purpose is to give the primary and principal items bearing on the subjects concerned; it will take a period of time to ascertain their full value. The volume is addressed to the educated public as a whole. For this reason, an attempt has been made to avoid unnecessary technicalities. This has given a pleasant readability to the articles, without accuracy being sacrificed.

Inevitably the question arises: How does this book stand from the Catholic point of view? Well, it can be said at once that the work has been prepared with a serene objectivity hardly conceivable in an earlier generation. On all matters proper to the different Christian churches a real and, it must be acknowledged, successful attempt has been made to secure impartial information. Lesser points of special interest to Catholics are generously represented in the *Dictionary*; they are handled with knowledge and sympathy, and the entries are evidently based on Catholic sources. Catholic works, both continental and English, are also mentioned very frequently

in the bibliographies. Then there is the whole range of factual matters where scholars of different Christian bodies are on common ground; here again the work is accurate and reliable. The real difficulty in a work of this kind comes in those articles, particularly doctrinal in character, where the disagreements amongst Christians must affect the whole treatment of the subject. However, even in these matters, the scholarly, historical approach of the authors and their fairness to divergent views make the book one that can be consulted with profit. No one, presumably, will expect a reviewer to give a *nihil obstat* to a reference book of this range, and it is stating the obvious to observe that there is an absence of commitment on some issues and a way of regarding others that distinguish it from a Catholic production. Perhaps the article which is most unsatisfactory and which one could have reasonably expected to be better is that on Modernism; there is no insight into the true nature of the movement. Nevertheless, it may be said that a fairly thorough perusal shows that no one capable of an intelligently critical judgement should find any difficulty in using this work to his advantage.

One weakness of the book deserves comment; it concerns grace. The article on grace is poor. Grace is considered as a supernatural aid and the entry is largely concerned with the controversies about it. The distinctions used in the theology of grace are given at the end and here sanctifying grace is described as "the gift of God inhering in the soul by which men are enabled to perform righteous acts". All right as far as it goes; but in vain will one seek some adequate account of the effects of sanctifying grace, some treatment of grace as a share in the life of God—grace, in other words, seen not simply as an aid but as an elevation. There is no special article on habitual grace or sanctification or holiness. Nothing is to be found under supernatural, participation in the divine nature, adopted sonship, divinization, indwelling of Holy Spirit. The article "Imago Dei" which might have been the occasion for displaying some of the riches of Eastern thought on grace must again be judged poor. The entry on justification does not do more than list the meanings given to the term. A mention of original righteousness and a longer account of original sin bring us near to the subject, but only near. In short, while the book gives abundant measure in dealing with the institutional aspect of the Christian Church, it is sparing when it treats its inner life of grace. Only to be expected, it may be retorted, in a reference work intended to give factual information. To some extent the retort is true and it would be wrong to push the criticism too far. Nevertheless, it is difficult to avoid the impression that an important region of Catholic theological thought receives scant attention in its pages.

Dogmatic Theology. I. The True Religion. By Mgr G. Van Noort, S.T.D. From the fifth edition edited by the Rev. J. P. Verhaar, S.T.D. Translated and revised by John J. Castelot, S.S., and William R. Murphy, S.S. Pp. lviii + 324. (The Mercier Press, Cork. 30s.)

THE manual of Mgr Van Noort is known the world over. When the first instalment of the American revision and translation of it appeared, it was reviewed favourably in these pages (September 1956, pp. 546-8). This is an Irish edition of the same volume. It is exactly the same book, printed in the United States, and the only difference is in the binding and the price. The change in the latter is welcome; thirty shillings is nearer the student's purse than six dollars. There are nine volumes to come, and let us hope their preparation is well advanced.

St Augustine and His Search for Faith. By Milton Lomask. Illustrated by Johannes Troyer. Pp. 190. (Vision Books, 21. Burns Oates. 12s. 6d.)

THERE is already a long list of titles in the series *Vision Books*. It consists of lively biographies of saints and other Christian heroes written for children from nine to fifteen. This one is an account of the early life of Augustine and of his journey to the faith. The device of the flashback is used, so that the book opens with the scene of the writing of the *Confessions* and closes with a description of his death. The tale is told in an interesting fashion. The author knows well how to tell a story, and his narrative will hold the attention of the children. The form chosen is the brisk dramatic method of popular historical fiction.

It would be unbearably pompous to criticize the details of this slight work. What is more important is to ask whether the book conveys at its level and for the readers it addresses the great figure of Augustine. Are these readers given a good general impression of his personality and experience? The answer is No. There is a great deal of colourful background and lively incident but not much of the real Augustine. The illustrations are quite good.

C. D.

St Thomas Aquinas and his Work. By A. M. Sertillanges, O.P. Pp. xviii + 150. (Blackfriars Publications. 10s. 6d.)

THE late Fr Sertillanges is rightly considered as one of the leading Dominican scholars of modern times, with an assured place alongside such authorities as Mandonnet and M. J. Lagrange. He was

renowned for his sermons at Notre Dame and at the Madeleine, for his lectures at the *Institut Catholique*, and for the wide range of his writings, particularly on philosophical, moral and sociological questions. These writings, from his profound study entitled *St Thomas D'Aquin* to the work on the problem of Evil (which he had almost completed at his death in 1948), reveal a mastery of scholastic principles and method; indeed, many of his brother-Dominicans were convinced that he would have become the greatest metaphysician of his time, had he devoted himself entirely to philosophy. His own conviction that Thomism should reappear as a real living force, instead of remaining as an interesting monument of the past, and his lively temperament, alike drew him away from purely academic interests and caused him to apply his great powers to more popular writings and lectures, in which he strove to impart the spirit of St Thomas to the large body of intelligent Catholics who would have neither the opportunity nor the inclination to tackle the Thomism of the textbooks.

A number of these popular works were translated by Fr Godfrey Anstruther in the early 1930's, and now Blackfriars Publications have reissued one of these, *St Thomas Aquinas and his Work*. The book is not a new edition but an exact reproduction of the translation issued in 1932. In his original prefatory note Fr Anstruther explained that he had aimed at a free translation, but one feels that this English version would have benefited even more from some careful editing; the many references to Péguy and Valéry, Le Roy, Lasserre and others, indicate that Fr Sertillanges had been writing for the educated French Catholic of the early decades of this century, who would appreciate the comments of the Intellectuals of his day. The remarks which he quotes may well retain their value, but these personalities will hardly appear significant to the modern English Catholic to whom, presumably, this re-issue is directed. It is likely that those who seek a short but comprehensive account of the philosophy of St Thomas will turn to Fr Copleston's excellent work, still available in the Pelican series; in any case, Fr Sertillanges had implied that this small book was not intended to be a philosophical study, but rather to serve as a short general introduction.

A History of Philosophy. By Carmin Mascia, T.O.R., D.D., Ph.D.
Pp. 513. (St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey. \$5.)

FR MASCIA teaches philosophy in an American seminary of the Third Order Recollects, Franciscans who have many houses in the United States. His *History of Philosophy* is an ambitious project since he endeavours to cover the whole range of western philosophical

thought, in the space of 500 pages. To this end he has divided his book into three main sections, dealing in turn with Greek, Christian and Modern Philosophy. Each section starts with an Introduction, which is followed by a summary of that Introduction; then each chapter in turn is prefaced by a scheme and followed by its own summary and bibliography. This somewhat rigid schematic form will doubtless commend the work to the many seminary students who adopt a similar method in their own study, although others might prefer a more discursive treatment. They will find the bibliographies useful, even though pride of place is naturally given to works published in the United States.

The section on Greek Philosophy runs to 110 pages. Its bibliography includes works by Gomperz, Zeller and Burnet, but contains no mention of Jaeger, Cornford or Guthrie. When Fr Mascia turns to Christian philosophy and tries to fit that vast subject into 108 pages, the results are less happy, since the limitation upon his space means that he is unable to do justice, whether to individual thinkers, such as St Anselm and Abelard (and William of Ockham has hardly more than a page to himself!), or to general movements in scholasticism, such as the influence of the Arabian philosophers or the condemnation of 1277. Here also one would wish to see reference to parallel works on the history of scholastic philosophy, but no mention can be found of such authorities as De Wulf, Van Steenberghen or Copleston.

Fr Mascia has made use of various typographical devices, large and small print and italics of different sorts. When he wishes to add emphasis to some point he uses bold face italics, while light face italics are reserved for what he describes as the "Golden Thread of Truth", a phrase which he applies to the *philosophia perennis*. This thread, taken up from the very start of Western philosophy with the Ionians, runs strongly through the centuries of Christian thought, only to disappear with Ockham and the Nominalists. For the remaining half of the book, in the 250 pages that he devotes to modern philosophy, those italics are not to be found, save for an odd line or two here and there, until Fr Mascia comes to the scholastic revival in modern times, when the italics reappear and the thread is taken up again. This method of recounting the history of philosophy will certainly appeal to the student who is, presumably, committed to scholastic philosophy and who studies that history precisely to see the gradual fashioning of the notions which, he feels, have reached their perfection in scholasticism; others, however, may feel that the search for a "Golden Thread of Truth" is difficult to reconcile with the need for objectivity in the historian.

The Road to Inner Freedom. By Baruch Spinoza. Edited and with an Introduction by Dagobert D. Runes. Pp. 215. (The Philosophical Library, New York. \$3.)

THIS book is not a newly discovered work by Spinoza, as the unusual title might suggest, but a new edition of the *Ethics*, making use of the translation by R. H. M. Elwes. As such it would hardly call for comment, even though Professor Runes, who is well known for his other writings on the philosophy of Spinoza, has made a number of changes in the text, relying upon the Bruder edition of the Latin original. Much more radical, however, are the changes that he has made in the presentation of Spinoza's great treatise, and, while in his Introduction he leaves it to the reader to decide whether these changes have rendered the treatise more intelligible, Professor Runes will surely have to face considerable criticism from many students of Spinoza. The *Ethics*, after all, was Spinoza's greatest achievement: published after his death, it had held his attention for the last fifteen years of his short life. If the seventeenth century was the Age of Method, ushering in the Age of Reason, then certainly the *Ethics* was the most notable example of the application of scientific method in philosophy. Spinoza shared with Descartes, Hobbes and Leibniz the conviction that, in any department of scientific enquiry, error would result from the way in which men obtruded their personalities into their judgements. To avoid this sort of error, particularly obnoxious in the study of human conduct, Spinoza believed that ethics must be constructed *more geometrico*, with the impartiality and objectivity of mathematics, by dealing with the principles that govern human desires and deeds "in the same spirit as one would consider lines, planes and solids".

Professor Runes, however, seems to have decided that the mathematical construction of the *Ethics* has proved an obstacle which must be removed if the ordinary man is to appreciate Spinoza's work; and the explanatory notes on the jacket of the book include the surprising assertion that Spinoza had elected to use this mathematical formulation, and the Scholastic terminology, simply to avoid arousing the ire of the religious authorities. To be sure, those authorities had given him good reason for his apprehensions; even as recently as 1954, the Jewish religious leaders refused to heed Mr Ben Gurion's plea to withdraw the excommunication imposed on him 300 years ago; but it is a mistake to think that the mathematical method sprang from any such extrinsic motives. On the contrary, it was regarded as essential for the understanding of all the problems of philosophy and of science, to take mathematical physics as the single ideal pattern of human knowledge; the use of this method was the hallmark of the rationalist philosophers of that time

and Spinoza's *Ethics* has always been accepted as the classical example of that method. Starting with the clear, distinct ideas, of Substance, Cause, Attribute, Freedom and Necessity, the whole treatise was most carefully constructed as a succession of propositions with supporting proofs, lemmas and corollaries, so that gradually one would see how all these ideas, and the aspects of Nature which they represented, were mutually dependent and interwoven.

With this edition, however, the mathematical construction is effectively shattered and in its place we are offered Professor Runes' own selection, beginning not with God or with Mind, but with propositions from Parts III-V, concerning the nature and strength of the human emotions and intelligence; and only then does he pick out a handful of propositions concerning Substance, God and other ideas from Part I, without the explanation which those propositions require. The scholastic philosopher, of course, can find many grave defects both in Spinoza's moral theory and in the metaphysical principles which he formulates. He will echo the protest made by Boxel: "I do not know your God, or what you mean by the word"; yet, in fairness to the great Jewish philosopher, he will surely insist that the *Ethics* should be studied in the form and setting in which Spinoza had constructed it.

J. MOLLOY

Other People. By Wingfield Hope. Pp. 181. (Sheed & Ward. 10s. 6d.)

THOSE who have read and appreciated the above writer's *Life Together* will be interested to know that she has here resumed her theme of interpersonal relationships, though on a wider plane: for the problem she now confronts is how to live with other people generally, both inside and outside of the home. Christian charity, she suggests, universal as it is in its object, must nevertheless respect the special character of our various relationships, and maintain the right balance. A sound relationship requires not only a perceptive knowledge of oneself and the other person, but a realization of the limits of our knowledge. It excludes mere play-acting, because only one's real self can establish and preserve a real relationship with another. As in her earlier book, her points are always illustrated by practical examples. Instead of merely applying general principles to stock cases, she endeavours to project herself into sample situations, so as to detect and mark the pitfalls which are likely to trap the unwary, however sound their principles and however genuine their desire to establish the right relationship with those whose lives are intertwined with their own. Her book contains much thoughtful counsel and should provide spiritual reading of the practical kind.

L. L. McR.

CORRESPONDENCE

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1958, p. 126)

"Senex, P.P.", writes:

About open-air services, I remember trying these in a modest way, as a young curate forty-five years ago in a fairly large town with slums. It seemed the obvious thing to do, but not many Catholics would come out of their homes to the service. I think they disliked being shown up to their non-Catholic neighbours. I gave the services up after a young mother-of-four said in reply to my invitation: "If I wanted to do that I should come to church."

But my purpose in writing is to demur to Fr Pargiter's idea of using loud-speakers. I live in an urban district where Protestant revivalists often use loud-speakers, and so do the politicians at local and national election-times. It seems to me a hateful intrusion on ordinary peaceful folk, and I am sure it would be a mistake for Catholics to do that kind of thing.

THE NEW PSALTER

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1958, p. 122)

The Rev. J. O'Reilly writes:

The peculiar Latin of the Gallican Psalter was due not to Patristic influence, but to the fact that it was a very literal translation from the Septuagint. It was not essentially S. Jerome's work; he merely touched it up. The reason why it invariably employs "quia" or "quoniam" instead of the A.C.I. is simply that the Greek always has "hoti". Similarly the noun "Salutare", which is outlandish by the standards of any period of Latin, is merely a copy of the Septuagint's "to swtêrion", "salus" being reserved to render "swtêria". Comparison of the contexts of these two Greek forms shows that they are used with identical meaning, and comparison with our present Hebrew text gives no reason but arbitrary taste for the variation.

The fact is that the Gallican Psalter, like the Vulgate N.T., stands outside the great stream of the language of the Latin Fathers. Their idiom was based fairly and squarely on the classical tradition, and it may therefore be truly contended that the Vatican Psalter

actually re-integrates the psalms into the main-flow of Christian Latin. Revelation is a unity, but the Vulgate certainly isn't. What the new version has normally rejected is not sound patristic vocabulary, but the oddities of Septuagintese.

The Gallican Psalter is always available for anyone who wishes to study the exegesis of St Augustine, but what the translators were asked to provide was a version of the psalms straight from the Hebrew for the use of ordinary priests in their daily prayers. Why should it be "unacceptable" to use as a norm the type of Latin which all those priests have had to spend many years studying, and which is used universally in textbooks, papal documents and the day-to-day life of the modern church?

I hope Fr Dilworth will not be too angry if I offer him another illustration from our own language and suggest that there is a close parallel between Septuagintese in Church Latin and Mostchastepousery (or, for that matter, Spousemostchastery) in Catholic English.

"SIMPLE" CATHOLICS

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1958, p. 65)

The Rev. Alexander Gits, S.J., writes:

The admirable article on "English and Latin at Mass" carries a phrase which may be misleading. It speaks of the "often quoted and rarely encountered *simple* Catholics".

This seems to mean that such Catholics are few in numbers. The great majority of Catholics are in fact the "simple" in contrast to the "educated". This important point is often forgotten by Catholic authors and journalists but not by the "children of darkness" nor by the moralists!

Communitistic propaganda is largely addressed to simple minds in order to win the multitudes. *Fas est ab hoste docere*. Far from being "rarely encountered" simple Catholics are the great majority in the Flock of Christ.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

s
e
e
y
n
d
e
er
se
s-
lic

es a
and

The
t to
olic
nor

inds
eing
n the

ned for
W.1, in